

**'A PLAY IS NOT SO YDLE  
A THING': THE DRAMATIC  
OUTPUT AND THEATRE-CRAFT  
OF NATHAN FIELD**

**by**

**MARGARET ELLEN WILLIAMS**

**A thesis submitted to the  
Faculty of Arts of the  
University of Birmingham  
for the degree of  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY**

**Shakespeare Institute  
University of Birmingham  
Birmingham B15 2TT**

**May 1992**

UNIVERSITY OF  
BIRMINGHAM

**University of Birmingham Research Archive**

**e-theses repository**

This unpublished thesis/dissertation is copyright of the author and/or third parties. The intellectual property rights of the author or third parties in respect of this work are as defined by The Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988 or as modified by any successor legislation.

Any use made of information contained in this thesis/dissertation must be in accordance with that legislation and must be properly acknowledged. Further distribution or reproduction in any format is prohibited without the permission of the copyright holder.

## SYNOPSIS

Nathan Field, an actor contemporary with Burbage, is virtually unknown as a playwright. His work reflects the fact that he was an all-round man of the theatre, so Part One is largely biographical, tracing Field's involvement as actor, manager and writer with the Children of the Revels, the Lady Elizabeth's Men and the King's Men. In Part Two, which lays the foundations for Part Three, I investigate Field's authorship, or part-authorship, of six collaborative plays: *The Fatal Dowry*, with Massinger, *The Honest Man's Fortune*, *Four Plays in One*, *The Queen of Corinth* and the *Knight of Malta* from the 'Beaumont and Fletcher' folio of 1647, and the anonymous manuscript play *The Faithful Friends*.

Part Three deals with Field's dramatic output as pieces for the theatre, examining them in terms of theatre resources, their relationships with their spectators and their verbal and non-verbal communication. The conclusion supplies a perspective from which to view and to evaluate Field's work, by considering it in relation to popular theatre tradition, and by reviewing its limited performance history.

Approximately 105,000 words

**For Dave**





Portrait of Nathan Field  
Dulwich Picture Gallery



I send a Comedie to you heer, as  
good as I could then make; nor  
sleight my presentation, because it is  
a play; for I tell thee Reader, if thou  
bee'st ignoraunt, a Play is not so ydle  
a thing as thou art, but a Mirrour of  
mens lives...

N.F.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I should like to thank the staff of Dulwich Picture Gallery, James Flecker, Dr James Fowler, Mark Nash-Williams, Dr Jan Piggett, Dr Gary Taylor, Graham Watts and Professor Glynne Wickham for their assistance during the preparation of this thesis. I am particularly indebted to Dr Susan Brock and the Staff of the Shakespeare Institute, to Jim Heath and David Williams, and to my supervisor, Dr Robert Smallwood. Without their unfailing patience, encouragement and help this thesis would not have been completed.

## Note on Procedures

For most purposes quotations from Field, Massinger and the 'Beaumont and Fletcher' plays are taken from the editions of William Peery (Austin, 1950), Philip Edwards and Colin Gibson, 5 vols (Oxford, 1976), and Fredson Bowers, 7 vols (Cambridge, 1966- ) respectively, except where close biographical analysis has necessitated use of the original quarto and folio printings. For the 'Beaumont and Fletcher' plays not yet edited for the Bowers edition, quotations are taken from the 1647 folio, but for the convenience of the reader, act, scene and page numbers are given from the edition of Glover and Waller, 10 vols (Cambridge, 1905-12). Quotations from Shakespeare are taken from the edition of Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor (Oxford, 1988). Where quotations have been transcribed from old spelling the original spelling has been retained, but the long 's', 'i' and 'u' have been normalised and contractions have been expanded. Old-style dates have normally been altered to conform with the modern calendar year.

### Abbreviations for standard works:

Brinkley	Roberta F.Brinkley, <i>Nathan Field, The Actor Playwright</i> (New Haven, 1928)
DNB	<i>Dictionary of National Biography</i>
ELH	<i>English Literary History</i>
Eliz. Stage	E.K.Chambers, <i>The Elizabethan Stage</i> , 4 vols (Oxford, 1923)
Greg, Bibliography	<i>A Bibliography of the English Printed Drama to the Restoration</i> , 4 vols (London, 1939-59)
Jac. and Car. Stage	G.E.Bentley, <i>The Jacobean and Caroline Stage</i> , 7 vols (Oxford, 1941-68)
MLR	<i>Modern Language Review</i>
PMLA	<i>Proceedings of the Modern Language Association</i>
OED	<i>Oxford English Dictionary</i>
RES	<i>Review of English Studies</i>
RORD	<i>Research Opportunities in Renaissance Drama</i>
SEL	<i>Studies in English Literature</i>



STC	A.W.Pollard and G.R.Redgrave, <i>A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland and Ireland.....</i> , second edition, 3 vols (London, 1976-91)
Wing	<i>Short Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, Ireland....1641-1700</i> , compiled by Donald Wing, 3 vols (New York, 1945-51)

**Abbreviations for Texts:**

<i>Amends</i>	Nathan Field, <i>Amends for Ladies</i> (London, 1618)
Beaumont and Fletcher, F.1647	<i>Comedies and Tragedies written by Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher....</i> (London, 1647)
Beaumont and Fletcher, F.1679	<i>Fifty Comedies and Tragedies, written by Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher....</i> (London, 1679)
Dyce 9	<i>The Honest Man's Fortune: A Critical Edition of MS Dyce 9</i> , edited by J.Gerritsen (Djakarta and Groningen, 1952)
Edwards	Philip Massinger and Nathan Field, <i>The Fatal Dowry</i> , edited by Philip Edwards in <i>The Plays and Poems of Philip Massinger</i> , edited by Philip Edwards and Colin Gibson, 5 vols (Oxford, 1976), I, 1-95 and V, 96-110.
<i>Faithful Friends</i>	<i>The Faithful Friends</i> [Dyce 10], edited by G.M.Pinciss and G.R.Proudfoot, Malone Society (London, 1970 (1975))
<i>Fatal Dowry</i>	<i>The Fatall dowry: a tragedy...written by P.M. and N.F.</i> (London, 1632)
<i>Four Plays</i> 'Love'           ) 'Honour'       ) 'Time'           ) 'Death'          )	<i>Foure Playes (or Morall Representations) in One</i> , in <i>Comedies and Tragedies written by Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher...</i> (London, 1647)
<i>Honest Man's Fortune</i>	<i>The Honest Mans Fortune in Comedies and Tragedies written by Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher...</i> (London, 1647)
<i>Knight of Malta</i>	<i>The Knight of Malta in Comedies and Tragedies written by Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher...</i> (London, 1647)

Peery	<i>The Plays of Nathan Field</i> , edited by William Peery (Austin, 1950)
<i>Queen of Corinth</i>	<i>The Queene of Corinth in Comedies and Tragedies written by Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher...</i> (London, 1647)
Waller	<i>The Works of Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher</i> , edited by Arnold Glover and A.R.Waller, 10 vols (Cambridge, 1905-12)
<i>Weathercock</i>	<i>A Woman is a Weathercock...Written by Nat. Field</i> (London, 1612)

## CONTENTS

		Page
INTRODUCTION	Why?	1
PART ONE	Who?	
Chapter 1	Nathan Field, Player and Writer	11
PART TWO	What? Establishing Field's Canon	
Chapter 2	'Competent Witnesses'; methods and techniques	47
Chapter 3	<i>The Fatal Dowry</i>	102
Chapter 4	<i>The Honest Man's Fortune</i>	121
Chapter 5	<i>Four Plays, or Moral Representations, in One</i>	148
Chapter 6	<i>The Faithful Friends</i>	170
Chapter 7	<i>The Queen of Corinth</i>	188
Chapter 8	<i>The Knight of Malta</i>	209
PART THREE	Theatre Plays	
Chapter 9	Players and Stages	233
Chapter 10	Spectacle, Silence and Sound	251
Chapter 11	Players and Spectators	280
Chapter 12	Theatre Language	335
CONCLUSION	Field in Perspective	360
Postscript	A Production of <i>A Woman is a Weathercock</i>	386
APPENDIX I	The Portrait	393
APPENDIX II	List of Plays considered	396
APPENDIX III	Plays investigated but rejected	399
APPENDIX IV	Field as Reviser	429
BIBLIOGRAPHY		432

INTRODUCTION   Why?



In Dulwich College there is a well known portrait described in its catalogue as:

Master Feild's picture in his shirt; on a board in a black frame  
fileted with gold; an actor.<sup>1</sup>

The description is apt. It is as an actor that Field is known. From 1600 where at the age of thirteen he became one of the 'little eyases', by joining the Children of the Chapel, to 1619/20 when as one of 'the principall actors in all [Shakespeare's] playes' he died, Field was a successful professional player.<sup>2</sup> Throughout the seventeenth century his name was coupled with Richard Burbage's as a great actor. In 1614 in *Bartholomew Fair*, for examples, Cokes, fascinated by the 'small players' of a puppet theatre asks

...Which is your Burbage now?  
*Leatherhead*: What mean you by that, sir?  
*Cokes*: Your best actor, your Field?  
*Littlewit*: Good, i'faith. You are even with me, sir.<sup>3</sup>

Fifty years later Richard Flecknoe picks out as 'actors in their greatest flourish' Field and Burbage.<sup>4</sup> An audience at court in 1635 recognises not only his name but his acting style - clearly a contrast to that of the older actors, Burbage and Alleyn. Clyster enquires of Sir Cupid Phantsy

How now! at verse againe?  
*Ph*: No faith Sir, I was at my Prayers.  
*Cly*: What so lowd and acting as if *Burbedge's* soule had newly  
reviv'd *Hamlett*, & *Jeronimo* againe, or *Allen*, *Tamberlayne*?  
*Ph*: Nay, Sir, rather Feild, in *Love's Lyes a bleeding*.<sup>5</sup>

The prologue to Chapman's quarto edition of the play in 1641 assumes familiarity with Field's performance as Bussy D'Ambois.<sup>6</sup> More recently, by

virtue, presumably, of his association with Henslowe and with the plays of Jonson and Shakespeare, his progress from boy actor to King's Man, via membership and management of the Lady Elizabeth's company, has been briefly recorded. His portrait is frequently reproduced to illustrate histories of Elizabethan playhouses. Yet even now, with his reputation as an actor reasonably well established, there are problems in according Nathan Field proper recognition. Chief is one of nomenclature.

As long ago as 1928 Roberta Brinkley presented incontrovertible evidence to prove that Nathan and Nathaniel Field were not variant names for an actor who had turned publisher in later life but two separate individuals. The actor and writer is *Nathan* Field. It is as Nathan that he was baptized on October 17, 1587 and as Nathan he died sometime before August 20, 1620. He appears as Nathan in all early legal documents and as one of the 'principall actors in all these playes' in Shakespeare's First Folio. Unfortunately the habit of abbreviating 'Nathan' to 'Nat.', 'Nath.', or initial 'N.' on letters, title pages, verses, dedications and actor lists has led to Nathan's being confused with his elder brother, Nathaniel, baptized on June 13, 1581. Nathaniel, apprenticed to, and then registered as, a stationer, married, fathered several children and outlived his brother by twelve years or so. Despite Brinkley's proofs however, modern reference books and critical studies continue to use the name Nathaniel for the actor-playwright, and attribute to Nathan a wife, a family and a second career in printing.<sup>7</sup> These misunderstandings show just how little is known about Nathan Field.

Reader, the sale-man sweares, youle take it very ill, if I say not somewhat to you too, Introth you are a stranger to me; why should I Write to you? you never writ to mee, nor I thinke will not answere my Epistle.<sup>8</sup>

Field was right. Since 1612, when he addressed these mockingly aggressive



remarks 'To the Reader' of his play *A Woman is a Weathercock* Field the writer has been virtually ignored. George Chapman hoped 'in Fame so thrive thy Play' but he was disappointed.<sup>9</sup> None of Field's plays are well known; some titles are barely familiar. Although Field is responsible, at a conservative count, for two comedies, three tragicomedies, the major portion of a tragedy and significant shares in at least three other plays, his canon has not yet received extended critical examination.<sup>10</sup> Brinkley's 1928 monograph and William Peery's introduction to his 1950 edition of the two unaided comedies are necessarily selective in their emphasis.<sup>11</sup> Field's plays have virtually no performance history.<sup>12</sup>

Reasons for their neglect are not difficult to find. They relate to three major factors: the anti-theatrical dispositions of some critics; the difficulty of making appropriate judgments about works that are largely the product of collaboration; and, above all, the shiftingly uncertain nature of the canon itself. Clearly if Field is to be taken seriously as a playwright there is, first, a pressing need to establish what he wrote.

Field studies have been bedevilled with problems of attribution. The vexed history of Field's attributions is best shown in tabular form.<sup>13</sup> As Brinkley points out

when an unknown hand is detected in a drama a simple solution has been to attribute the work to Field.

(Brinkley, p.93)

Such attributions are usually made negatively. Field is credited with the 'residue' when playwrights like Beaumont, Fletcher or Massinger have received their shares. These problems are not just the legacy of the early disintegrators. Bertha Hensman's recent studies aggravate a difficult situation by including even more than Oliphant and Sykes do in their attri-



	1874-1876, 1889-1891 FLEAY	1880-6 1882-7 1899 BOYLE	1883 1910 MACAULAY	1889 BULLEN	1890-1 1927, 1930 OLIPHANT	1914 GAYLEY	1920 CRUIKSHANK	1923 1926 CHIELLI	1924 SYKES	1928 BRINKLEY	1956-1962 HOY	1960 1974 HENSMAN
BLOODY BROTHER (ROLLO)	1) Fletcher and ? Middleton 2) Fletcher, Massinger, Field, Johnson	1) Fletcher, Massinger, and 2 authors, not Beaumont 2) Fletcher, Field, Daborne, Massinger ? Wilkins	Massinger, Fletcher, Daborne, or Jonson, Field	Fletcher, Jonson revised, Massinger	Fletcher, Jonson, Massinger, Middleton and ?	-	3 hands Massinger	Fletcher Field Daborne Massinger	4 hands Not Field	not Field	Chapman Fletcher Jonson Massinger Fletcher and Massinger	Field and Fletcher revised Massinger
BONDUCA	1) Fletcher only 2) Fletcher and Field	Fletcher	Fletcher and (perhaps) Field	Fletcher	1) Fletcher (with Field) 2) Fletcher alone 3) Beaumont revised Fletcher	Beaumont	-	-	-	not Field	Fletcher alone	-
CUPID'S REVENGE	1) Beaumont and Fletcher 2) Beaumont and Fletcher revised Field	Fletcher, Beaumont and ?	Beaumont and Fletcher	Fletcher and Beaumont	Fletcher, Beaumont, Field (Massinger)	Beaumont Fletcher	-	-	-	not Field	Beaumont, Fletcher	-
FAITHFUL FRIENDS	Field, Daborne, or Daborne	no trace of Beaumont, Fletcher or, Massinger 'perhaps' Shirley	not Beaumont or Fletcher	-	Beaumont and Fletcher, revised Field and Massinger	not Beaumont	-	? 3 authors not Massinger	not Field	not Field	-	-
FOUR PLAYS	Beaumont, Fletcher	Beaumont, Fletcher, or not Fletcher	Beaumont and Fletcher	Fletcher, Beaumont	1) Fletcher, Field, Beaumont 2) Field and Fletcher	Fletcher Field Beaumont	-	-	Fletcher Field	Field Fletcher	Field Fletcher	Field Fletcher
HONEST MAN'S FORTUNE	1) Fletcher and Anon ? Beaumont 2) Fletcher, Field, Massinger, Daborne	1) Fletcher, Beaumont, + 3rd hand 2) Tourneur, Massinger, Beaumont, Fletcher	Tourneur, Massinger, Field, Fletcher	Fletcher, Massinger, Field	Tourneur, Webster, Field, Fletcher, Massinger	not Beaumont	not Massinger	not Massinger	Webster Massinger Field Fletcher	Field Fletcher Massinger	Field Field and Fletcher, Field and Massinger Fletcher Massinger	-
KNIGHT OF MALTA	1) Fletcher, Middleton 2) Beaumont and Fletcher 3) Field, Massinger, Fletcher	1) Beaumont, Fletcher + third hand 2) Beaumont, Fletcher, Massinger	Fletcher, Massinger 3rd author 'like Field'	Fletcher, Massinger, 'some other' not Beaumont	Fletcher, Massinger, Field, revising Beaumont?	not Beaumont	Massinger and Fletcher	Fletcher Massinger Field	Field Massinger Fletcher	Field Fletcher Massinger	Field Fletcher Massinger	Fletcher Field Massinger
LAWS OF CANDY	1) not Beaumont or Fletcher 2) Fletcher and Massinger 3) Field? Massinger?	1) not Beaumont, Fletcher or Massinger 2) 'perhaps' Shirley later withdrawn	Massinger and another - not Field	Massinger, Fletcher, 'hardly traced'	1) Beaumont and Massinger 2) Ford and Fletcher	not Beaumont	no trace of Massinger	-	Massinger and another - not Field, not Beaumont	not Field	Ford	'First version' Field and Fletcher revised Massinger
QUEEN OF CORINTH	1) Fletcher and (?) Middleton 2) Fletcher and Field, Massinger	1) Fletcher and Massinger and 'perhaps' Field 2) Fletcher and Massinger	Massinger, Fletcher, and 3rd author	Massinger, Fletcher, Middleton, Rowley	Fletcher, Massinger, Field	-	Massinger Fletcher ?	Fletcher Massinger Field	Field, Massinger Fletcher	Field Massinger Fletcher	Field Fletcher Massinger	Field and Fletcher revised Massinger as <i>The Fatal Ring</i>
THIERRY AND THEODORET	1) Fletcher and Massinger 2) Fletcher, Massinger, Field	1) Fletcher and Massinger + 3rd and 4th - not Beaumont 2) Fletcher, Massinger + 3rd Not Field	Massinger, Fletcher, or Beaumont or Field?	'some unknown author' Massinger, Fletcher	Fletcher, Massinger, Beaumont, revised Massinger and Field	not Beaumont	Some Massinger	Fletcher Massinger Field	Fletcher Webster Massinger	not Field	Beaumont Fletcher Massinger	Field Fletcher
A VERY WOMAN	Fletcher, Massinger	Fletcher, Massinger, + a third hand?	Fletcher, revised Massinger	Fletcher revised Massinger	Fletcher, Massinger	-	Massinger and Fletcher	Fletcher Massinger	-	-	Fletcher revised Massinger	<i>The Prince of Tarent</i> Field and Fletcher revised <i>The Very Woman</i> Massinger

CHART TO SHOW ATTRIBUTIONS TO FIELD



butions to Field. She assigns to Field plays he wrote with Fletcher which are now

permanently lost...fragmented and buried beneath the later materials with which Massinger, in his work as reviser enclosed and encrusted them.

(Hensman, *Shares*, p.378)

Such attributions to irrecoverable plays must remain of limited theoretical interest.

If past scholars have been too ready to give Field's name to unknown or irretrievable plays, they have been equally ready to ignore his shares. He has suffered from being regarded as the junior partner in any enterprise. Only where no more august name presents itself is work attributed to Field. Plays in which Field was a major, if not sole, contributor have received critical attention as the work of another playwright. His work has been attributed to other authors.<sup>14</sup> Texts of his plays appear in volumes with other names on the title pages and are then discussed by critics as if they contain no work by Field. So for any literary discussion of *The Fatal Dowry*, *The Honest Man's Fortune* or *Four Plays in One*, one has to refer to criticism on Massinger, Fletcher and Beaumont respectively.

These problems are not new, even where Field's authorship is certain. In 1667 *A Woman is a Weathercock* by Nathan Field formed part of a successful season for the Duke's company at Lincoln's Inn Fields which 'prov'd as beneficial to the company as several succeeding new plays'.<sup>15</sup> Field's contribution to their success went unrecognized: his play was falsely attributed to James Shirley (Downes, p.60). Between 1702 and 1776 Nicholas Rowe's *The Fair Penitent* was the sixth most frequently performed tragedy in London.<sup>16</sup> With characters renamed and the action transferred from Dijon

to Genoa, this play is an adaptation of *The Fatal Dowry*, the tragedy 'by P.M. and N.F.'<sup>17</sup> Neither Field nor Massinger received any credit for it, though Massinger could easily have done so. He had already included the tragedy as his unaided work in the Harbord volume of 1633.<sup>18</sup>

One reason, then for the neglect of Field as a playwright is the nature of his canon: insignificant or frustratingly amorphous depending on quantitative attribution, or simply unacknowledged. The situation is further exacerbated by the fact that so much of Field's work occurs in isolated scenes. Whole plays respond more easily to critical analysis. Scholarship has been more concerned with sorting out attribution of scenes than defining their dramatic quality.

A further barrier to literary study is the matter of genres. *A Woman is a Weathercock* and *Amends for Ladies* are both witty intrigue comedies but are not sufficiently satiric or urban to merit classification as 'city' or 'citizen' comedy.<sup>19</sup> They do not fit neatly into the romance tradition though 'Love' in *Four Plays* comes close to it. 'Honour', *The Faithful Friends*, *The Honest Man's Fortune*, *The Queen of Corinth* and *The Knight of Malta* are of mixed genres, the closest being tragi-comedy which has only recently received much critical attention.<sup>20</sup> It is difficult to describe the Field scenes of *The Fatal Dowry* as wholly tragic.

Neglect based on a lack of coherence - in the absence of an easily identified canon and unified genre - explains why Field is so little discussed by literary critics. Yet there is an alternative approach that makes it possible to study his work. Field was an actor. With a playwright who is also an actor, theatre based criteria can replace literary ones and a significant body of work can be examined in the context of theatre spaces and conventions of the time. It is because Field was a practical man of the theatre that his work as a writer is so interesting. Field, like Shakespeare, Heywood, Garrick, Coward or Ayckbourn, knows from experience what works or does not work on stage.



He is familiar with the theatre buildings and the spectators for whom he is writing. A recognition of the theatrical qualities of Field's writing can supply the missing coherence. Of course, theatrical and literary values are not mutually exclusive, but one can reach a better understanding of the thematic and stylistic aspects of his work if these are examined in the context of his theatre techniques. Field's plays and scenes share, for example, common satiric concerns. They rest on shared assumptions about duty, honour and what is reasonable in human behaviour. His attitude to, and treatment of women, is strikingly consistent through the range of his work whether tragic, comic or tragi-comic. The same kind of moral imperatives inform his pieces. These can be best appreciated by considering the theatrical methods he uses to create humour or pathos, or to command the assent of his spectators. One can reassess the quality of Field's flexible blank verse and his varied prose when these are discussed in terms of words for players to speak and contrasted with other ways in which Field creates spectacular stage effects. It is to explore and reassess Field's theatrical qualities that is the aim of this thesis. One definition of a play is offered by Keith Sturges. It exists, he says, 'in that special place where actors and audience interact'.<sup>21</sup> Field's familiarity with 'that special place' as an actor is well documented, as the Dulwich portrait and numerous references testify. My concern is to map out its geography for Field the playwright.

My discussion of Field's plays and scenes has two prerequisites: placing him in his theatrical context, and establishing what he actually wrote. These are the subjects of the first and second sections of the thesis. The central section consists of detailed analysis of all of Field's plays and scenes in terms of their theatrical qualities and the thesis concludes with a general evaluation of his dramatic art.



## NOTES

1. G.F.Warner, *Catalogue of Manuscripts and Muniments of Dulwich College* (London, 1881), p.207; *Mr Cartwright's Pictures: A Seventeenth Century Collection*, Dulwich Picture Gallery (London, 1987), pp.46-47. Though the portrait has been used extensively to illustrate books of theatrical history and criticism, the identity of the sitter is not absolutely certain. See Appendix 1.
2. For details of Field's life see Brinkley; F.G.Fleay, 'Annals of the Career of Nathaniel Field', *Englische Studien*, 13 (1889), 28-36; E.Verhasselt, 'A Biography of Nathan Field, Dramatist and Actor', *Revue Belge de philologie et d'histoire*, 25 (1946-7), 485-508; *Eliz. Stage*, II.23-61, 316-318; *Jac. and Car. Stage*, I, 176-197, 299-303, II, 434-436; Edwin Nungezer, *A Dictionary of Actors* (New Haven, 1929), pp.135-41; Irby B.Cauthen Jr., 'Nathan Field', in *Jacobean and Caroline Dramatists*, edited by Fredson Bowers, *Dictionary of Literary Biography*, 58 (Detroit, 1987), pp.86-90. Rosencrantz refers to the new fashion for boy companies in *Hamlet*, II.2.340. Field appears as fourth in the second column of the list of actors appearing in the front matter of Shakespeare's first folio.
3. Ben Jonson, *Bartholomew Fair*, edited by E.A.Horsman, *The Revels Plays* (London, 1960), V.3.79.
4. Richard Flecknoe, *Love's Kingdom. A pastoral trage-comedy...With a short treatise of the English Stage...* (London, 1664), reprinted in W.C.Hazlitt, *The English Drama and Stage under the Tudor and Stuart Princes, 1534-1664* (London, 1869), pp.275-81 (p.277).
5. This passage is cited by S.Schoenbaum, 'Wit's *Triumvirate* A Caroline Comedy Recovered', *SEL*, 4 (1964), 227-37 (p.236). See also the edition of the play by Cathryn Anne Nelson, *Salzburg Studies in English Literature*, 57 (Salzburg, 1975), IV.4.594-600.
6. George Chapman, *Bussy D'Ambois*, edited by Nicholas Brooke, *The Revels Plays* (London, 1964), reprinted Manchester, 1979, p.147.
7. See Brinkley, pp.10-15, and her appendices, p.153, in which she reproduces letters of administration for the estates of Nathan, 2 August 1620, and Nathaniel, 26 March 1632. See also W.W.Greg, 'Field and the Beaumont and Fletcher Folio of 1679', *RES*, 3 (1927), 337-38. Examples of the continuing confusion between Nathan and Nathaniel are provided by Ivor Brown, *Shakespeare and the Actors* (London, 1970); B.B.George, *Stage Lives* (Connecticut and London, 1985); Andrew Gurr, *Playgoing in Shakespeare's London* (Cambridge, 1987); Dieter Mehl, *The Elizabethan Dumb Show* (London, 1965); *Shakespeare Dictionary*, edited by S.Clark (London, 1986).



8. 'To the Reader', *A Woman is a Weather-cocke*, Q.1612, sig. [A3v].
9. George Chapman, 'To his Loued Sonne, Nat. Field, and his Wether-cocke Woman', *A Woman is a Weather-Cocke*, Q.1612, sig. [A4r].
10. Alexander Leggatt is a notable exception but his study mentions only the comedies. *Citizen Comedy in the Age of Shakespeare* (Toronto, 1973).
11. Peery's edition includes *A Woman is a Weathercock* and *Amends for Ladies*.
12. There were performances of adaptations of *The Knight of Malta* and of *Four Plays*, 'Honour' in London in 1783 and of *A Woman is a Weathercock* at Stratford-upon-Avon in 1914. These productions will be discussed in my last chapter.
13. This chart is not intended to be comprehensive. I have not included, for example, all Fleay's changes of mind, or all of Oliphant's revisions. Neither have I included T.M.Parrott's suggestions that Field was involved in the revisions of *Timon of Athens* and *Bussy D'Ambois*. The chart's purpose is merely to illustrate present difficulties of Field attribution. The information, sometimes conflated, has been derived from F.G.Fleay, 'On Metrical Tests as applied to Dramatic Poetry', *Transactions of the New Shakespere Society*, 1-2 (London, 1874), 51-84, revised as Chapter 3 of his *Shakespeare Manual* (London, 1876), pp.151-74; 'Annals'; *A Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama, 1559-1642*, 2 vols (London, 1891); Robert Boyle, 'Beaumont, Fletcher and Massinger', *Transactions of the New Shakspere Society*, 8-10 (1880-6), 579-628; Robert Boyle, 'Beaumont, Fletcher and Massinger', *Englische Studien*, 5 (1882), 74-96; 7 (1884), 66-87; 8 (1885), 39-61; 9 (1886), 209-39; 10 (1887), 383-412; 'Daborne's Share in the Beaumont and Fletcher Plays', *Englische Studien*, 26 (1899), 352-69; G.C.Macaulay, 'Beaumont and Fletcher', in *Cambridge History of English Literature*, edited by A.W.Ward and A.R.Waller, 15 vols (reprinted Cambridge, 1932-33), VI, 121-154, 155-59; *Francis Beaumont, A Critical Study* (London, 1883); E.H.Oliphant, 'The Works of Beaumont and Fletcher', *Englische Studien*, 14 (1890), 53-94; 'The Works of Beaumont and Fletcher', *Englische Studien*, 15 (1891), 321-60; E.H.C.Oliphant, *The Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher: An Attempt to Determine their Respective Shares and the Shares of Others* (New Haven, 1927); 'The Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher: Some Additional Notes', *Philological Quarterly*, 9 (1930), 7-22; A.H.B[ullen], 'John Fletcher' in *DNB*, VII, 303-11; C.M.Gayley, *Francis Beaumont, Dramatist* (London, 1914); A.Cruikshank, *Philip Massinger* (Oxford, 1920); Maurice Chelli, *Le Drame de Massinger* (Lyon, 1923); *Etudes sur la collaboration de Massinger avec Fletcher et son groupe* (Paris, 1926); H.D.Sykes, *Sidelights on Elizabethan Drama: A Series of Studies dealing with the Authorship of Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century Plays* (London, 1924); Brinkley; Cyrus Hoy, 'The Shares of Fletcher and his



Collaborators in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon I', *Studies in Bibliography*, 8 (1956), 129-46; 'II', 9 (1957), 143-162; 'III', 11 (1958), 85-106; 'IV', 12 (1959), 91-116; 'V', 13 (1960), 77-108; 'VI', 14 (1961), 45-67; 'VII', 15 (1962), 71-90; Bertha Hensman, *The Shares of Fletcher, Field and Massinger in Twelve Plays of the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon*, Jacobean Drama Studies, 6, 2 vols (Salzburg, 1974); T.M.Parrott, 'The Date of Chapman's *Bussy D'Ambois*, *MLR* 3 (1908), 126-40; *The Problem of Timon of Athens*, Shakespeare Association Papers, 10 (1923).

14. A recent example occurs in Mary Beth Rose, *The Expense of Spirit* (Ithaca, 1988). *The Knight of Malta* is attributed to Fletcher and Massinger with no mention of Field's share in the play. Rose spends six pages discussing the play and actually quotes from I.3 and V.2, both scenes written by Field (pp.232, 233).
15. J.Downes, *Roscius Anglicanus* (1708), edited by Judith Milhous and Robert D.Hume (London, 1987), p.60.
16. John Genest, *Some Account of the English Stage*, 10 vols (Bath, 1832) II, 281-290.
17. Nicholas Rowe, *The Fair Penitent*, edited by Malcolm Goldstein, Regents Restoration Drama (Nebraska and London, 1969), p.xiv.
18. *The Plays and Poems of Philip Massinger*, edited by Philip Edwards and Colin Gibson, 5 vols (Oxford, 1976), 1, xxxii.
19. Brian Gibbons and Alexander Leggatt established the parameters for the discussion of Jacobean comedy. Recent critical interest has centred on 'the city staged'. Brian Gibbons, *Jacobean City Comedy; A Study of satiric plays by Jonson, Marston and Middleton* (London, 1968), second edition (London, 1980); Theodore Levinwand, *The City Staged: Jacobean Comedy, 1603-1613* (Madison, Wisconsin, 1986); Gail Kern Paster, *The Idea of the City in the Age of Shakespeare* (Athens, Ga., 1985).
20. Notable examples are Clifford Leech, *The John Fletcher Plays* (London, 1962) and Philip Edwards, "'The danger not the death": the art of John Fletcher' in *Jacobean Theatre*, edited by John Russell Brown and Bernard Harris, Stratford-upon-Avon Studies, 1 (London, 1960), 159-177.
21. Keith Sturges, *Jacobean Private Theatre*, Theatre Production Studies (London and New York, 1987), p.119.

PART ONE Who?

## CHAPTER 1: Nathan Field, Player and Writer

.



This biographical introduction lays the foundation for what follows. There are several advantages to this. It avoids unnecessary repetition later in the thesis. It allows a fuller picture of Field to emerge. It supplies essential background information. Without the details of Field's working life one cannot establish the canon. And until one knows what he wrote one cannot discuss it. It allows Field's dramatic output to be placed in its theatrical context, and in relation to personal contacts and his non-dramatic writing. The section falls into three parts - a chronological survey of Field's association with acting companies, a brief account of his personal life and his other writing, and a discussion of his acting roles.<sup>1</sup>

(i)

The life of Field the player and the dramatic output of Field the playwright are inextricably linked. By the time Field wrote his first play at the age of twenty one or so he had already been a player for nine or ten years. Writing plays was just another facet of a theatre based life which encompassed company management and financial dealing as well as acting. It is to his practical experiences of pleasing audiences in a variety of contexts and conditions that one may attribute many of the defining characteristics of Field's dramatic work: its range, its flexible staging demands, its patent dependence on players, and, above all, its heightened sense of the needs of audiences. My discussion of Field's plays is, therefore, prefaced by a biographical survey of his involvement with companies, professional associates and, insofar as they can be determined, acting roles. In this I hope to complement by specific example other accounts of an Elizabethan actor's life which have been fully detailed elsewhere.<sup>2</sup> Further, a consideration of

Field's roles has implications, albeit very slight, for the debate on Elizabethan acting style.<sup>3</sup> Field began as a boy in the private theatre; he ended as a prominent member of the King's Men. In his career he covered almost all aspects of the Jacobean theatre.

If, in 1604, Middleton's Gallant had chosen

to call in at the Black-fryers, where he shall see a neast of Boyes  
able to ravish a man<sup>4</sup>

he would have been able to see Nathan Field in action. On 2 September 1600 Henry Evans signed a lease on the Blackfriars, paying Richard Burbage £40 for the privilege.<sup>5</sup> He intended to create a children's acting company. On 13 December 1600 Thomas Clifton was kidnapped on his way to school and according to his father, carried protestingly to the company,

there to sorte him w<sup>th</sup> mercenary players & such other children  
as by the abuse aforesaid they had there placed, and by lyke force  
& vyolence him there to detayne & compell him to exercyse the  
base trade of a mercynary enterlude player.

One of those 'other children' named by the irate father as a member of the company in late 1600 was Nathan Field.<sup>6</sup> Clifton implies that the other boys received the same cruel treatment as his son. Clifton stated that those selecting the boys for the company chose

those whom they thoughte moste fittest to acte and furnish the  
said playes.

Presumably all of the boys had shown some kind of talent before they were so unceremoniously selected for the company. Field, like Chappel, Mottram and young Clifton, was a grammar school boy. He was described as 'a



scholler of a gramer schole in London kepte by one Mr Monkaster', that is, St Paul's School.<sup>7</sup>

Why should Evans and his associates have thought Nathan Field a likely prospect? They might have seen him in performance. Richard Mulcaster, the high master of St Paul's School, was renowned for his interest in all aspects of theatre. His educational methods involved training his boys in dance, song and public speaking. While he was headmaster of Merchant Taylor's School theatrical performances were common.<sup>8</sup> He may be presumed to have carried his ideas with him when he moved to St Paul's. One of his scholars, for example, delivered a Latin oration as part of Dekker's *Nova Felix Arabia* for the Royal Entry on the Ides of March 1604. Grammar school boys as well as choristers were involved in pageants and triumphs like this.<sup>9</sup> Field's experience of public performance may well have begun even before 1600 and his association with the Children of the Revels.

The company that Field joined late in 1600 was very popular with the public. As Gilderstone tells Hamlet in the bad quarto

I'faith, my lord, novelty carries it away; for the principal public audience that come to them are turned to private plays and to the humour of children.<sup>10</sup>

They were equally popular at court. In the eleven or twelve years of Field's membership, despite all their changes of name and periodic lapses from favour, the Children performed at court in every season except one.

The complex and disturbed relationship of the Children with authority, their many changes of manager and of financing arrangements, and their movements from theatre to theatre, have been fully described by Brinkley, Chambers and others, and it is not necessary to rehearse them here.<sup>11</sup> The period from 1608-9 must serve as an example of the vicissitudes through which Field lived. The company had already run into trouble over



*Philotas, Eastward Ho* and *The Isle of Gulls* but had weathered royal disapproval and even imprisonment. Field himself may have spent time in prison as one of the 'sundry committed to Bridewell' over *The Isle of Gulls* affair.<sup>12</sup> Yet the company do not seem to have learned from experience. On 11 March 1608 Sir Thomas Lake wrote to Lord Salisbury

...for ye others who have offended in ye matter of ye Mynes and other lewd words which is ye children of ye blackfriars that though he had signified his mynde to your lo. by my lo. of Montgommery yet I should repeate it again That his G. had vowed they should never play more but should first begg their bred and he wold hve his vow performed And therefore my lo. Chamberlain by himselfe or your ll. at the table should take order to dissolve them, and to punish the maker besides.<sup>13</sup>

The plays referred to here are almost certainly Chapman's *The Conspiracy and Tragedy of Byron* and a non-extant play, possibly by Marston. These so offended the king that all the theatres were closed and, as Evans later testified, 'some of the boyes' were 'committed to prison by his Majesties command'.<sup>14</sup> Field may have been one of them, but the French ambassador who otherwise reports very fully on the incident does not name any of them (*Eliz. Stage*, III, 257). Chapman attempted to defend himself on the grounds that 'I see not myne owne Plaies; nor carrie the Actors tongues in my mouthe'.<sup>15</sup> Despite the king's vow, the children's company were back at court, performing there in the next three seasons.<sup>16</sup> By 4 January 1610 they were so much restored to royal favour that they were patented as Children of the Queen's Revels.<sup>17</sup> By now they had a new home at Whitefriars but the previous two years had been very unsettled. In 1608 they lost tenure of the Blackfriars theatre. The king's anger had closed the theatres and a period of virulent plague from July 1608 to December 1609 kept them closed. Some of the Children appeared during this time in the provinces but the London company was kept together by



Robert Keysar at his own expense, and they may have continued, for a short time, to perform at Blackfriars. His hope, as he explained in February 1610, was to have

continewed playes in the said house upon the ceasing of the general sickness.<sup>18</sup>

He succeeded, at least in part, for he was the payee for court performances by 'the children of the blackfriars' in 1608/9. The company eventually moved to Whitefriars, still with Keysar, and performed, as 'Children of Whitefriars', at court in 1609/10.<sup>19</sup>

These uncertainties - of favour, venue, manager and company name - are typical of Field's early working life. By contrast he seems to have spent the period 1610-13 in relative stability and it is to this time that his comedies *A Woman is a Weathercock* and *Amends for Ladies* can be assigned. Though Field was by now in his mid twenties he continued as a member of the Children's company. Court performances continued.<sup>20</sup>

When the Children of the Whitefriars (a return to an earlier name for Field's company) this time under Rosseter, amalgamated with the Lady Elizabeth's in an agreement with Henslowe in March 1613, Field remained a member, and by March 1614 he was the new company's leading representative. Bentley has outlined the duties of company representative and there is no need to repeat them here (Bentley, *Profession*, p.57). Suffice it to say that Field can be found negotiating with playwrights over scripts and payments, asking for compensation over loss of receipts and receiving court payments.<sup>21</sup> One further duty was to lead the company on tour but there is no evidence that Field did that. A provincial Lady Elizabeth's Company travelled extensively throughout 1613 and 1614, but I can find no trace of Field's name in any published provincial records.<sup>22</sup> Whether Field travelled

with the touring Lady Elizabeth's Men or not, and the absence of evidence seems to suggest not, he was certainly in London in the autumn of 1614, appearing at the Hope in *Bartholomew Fair*, before presenting the same play to the King. Field was the payee when on 11 June 1615 the Lady Elizabeth's Men were paid for performing at Court.<sup>23</sup>

Playing was not as profitable as animal baiting as Henslowe, the Lady Elizabeth's Men's financier, knew from experience. In 1608, for example, he had received three times as much in receipts for the Bear Garden as he had for the Fortune Theatre (Hosking, p.125). He clearly knew what he was doing, then, when he decided in 1614 to build the multipurpose arena that could also be used for animal baiting. The building therefore had 'a stage to be carried or taken awaie'.<sup>24</sup> This decision led to trouble between the players and Henslowe in which Field was involved. Articles of Grievance and of Oppression against Philip Henslowe, dated 1615 but referring to events of the previous years, show that Henslowe had not kept his promise to compensate the players for loss of revenue when the Hope was used for animal baiting.

...hee havinge denied to bee bound as aforesaid gave them onlie 40s: and for that Mr ffeild would not consent therevnto hee gave him soe much as his share out of 50: <sup>50: 6</sup> would have Come vnto; by wch: meanes hee is dylie indebted to ye Companie.

(*Henslowe Papers*, p.88)

Field, not entirely altruistically, clearly took a strong line with Henslowe and succeeded. Among other complaints against Henslowe were that he charged the company for private loans to individual members, that he placed inflated prices on props and costumes which he bought for them and that he saddled the company with too many gatherers. They also objected to the financial arrangements made on new members joining the company.

...hee brought in Mr: Pallant and shortie after Mr: dawes into the



said Companie; promisinge one 12s: a weeke out of his parte of the galleries; and the other 6: a weeke out of his parte of the galleries; and because Mr ffeild was thought not to bee drawne therevnto; hee promissed him six shillinges weeklie alsoe...

(*Henslowe Papers*, p.88)

Obviously as a practical man of the theatre Field was keen to guard his financial interests. That Henslowe was prepared to favour Field in this way indicates Field's value to him. As Jonson's tribute to him makes patent, Field's reputation as 'your best actor', to be placed on a par with Burbage, was well established by this time.<sup>25</sup> Henslowe may also have found him useful as a writer. *The Honest Man's Fortune* belongs to this period, as does his share of *Four Plays* and, perhaps, *The Faithful Friends*. Henslowe was also prepared to lend Field money on a personal basis. Letters from 'yor louing son Nat: Field' to 'Father Hinchlow' or from 'yor most thanckfull; and loving friends, Nat: Field' requesting money met with success.<sup>26</sup>

Despite their difficulties, the Lady Elizabeth's Men were successful at court. Surprisingly in view of its past production history and the imprisonment of two of its authors, the play chosen for 25 January 1614 was *Eastward Ho*.<sup>27</sup> On 1 November the same company, as we have seen, played *Bartholomew Fair* to the King.<sup>28</sup>

In the early spring of 1615 a third company joined Henslowe's amalgamated Lady Elizabeth's and Queen's Revels companies, the Prince Charles' Men.<sup>29</sup> They had spent much of the previous year touring.<sup>30</sup> On 3 June 1615 Philip Rosseter secured a patent to build a theatre for the three associated companies at Porter's Hall in Blackfriars.<sup>31</sup> The project did not prosper. Building work was stopped in September by order of the Lord Mayor, and though the theatre was not finally closed down until January 1616 very few performances were actually given in the incomplete building.<sup>32</sup> Since the title page of the 1618 quarto of Field's *Amends for Ladies* says that

it was 'acted at the Blacke-Fryers, both by the Princes Servants and the Lady Elizabeths', and since the theatre with the amalgamated company was only in operation between its patent on 3 June 1615 and its final closure in January 1616 the performance of *Amends for Ladies* in Rosseter's Blackfriars must have been in the latter half of 1615.

On Henslowe's death in January 1616 the association between Prince Charles' Men and the combined Lady Elizabeth's and Queen's Revels companies was temporarily disbanded.<sup>33</sup> There is no evidence for Brinkley's assertion that Field was touring the provinces (Brinkley, p.33). The Queen's Revels men visited Nottingham and Lancaster in February and Coventry and Leicester in June.<sup>34</sup> In the summer of 1616 Lady Elizabeth's Men, the provincial company supplemented by some players from London, were in Norwich, Leicester and Coventry.<sup>35</sup> In the spring of 1616 the Prince's Men toured Kent and East Anglia.<sup>36</sup> The records show no trace of Field being associated with any of these companies at this time, nor, as far as we know, was he with any other company on tour.

The London based companies of Prince's and Lady Elizabeth's Men reached some kind of agreement with Henslowe's son-in-law and heir, Edward Alleyn, and with Jacob Meade (*Henslowe Papers*, pp.90-91). The signatories to this agreement, dated 20 March 1616, do not include Nathan Field, and it is a fair assumption that he left the Henslowe group at around this date. The lost *The Jeweller of Amsterdam* 'by Mr Iohn Flesher, Nathan: Field, & Phillip Massinger' dates from around June 1616, and it is likely that it was a King's Men's play.<sup>37</sup> By the late autumn of 1616 Field was certainly a member of that company. The last verse of a poem now in the Bodleian which celebrates

the noble acts, and worthy facts  
Performed in November



and refers to 'the Benchers soe spruce, soe wise, so wittie', runs

But happie was this Project  
thrice happie was this Monday  
To Jeminges owld, and Burbige bould  
Natt Feild, and Harry Cundy.<sup>38</sup>

The Barriers in question formed part of the festivities to mark the investiture of Prince Charles as Prince of Wales on 4 November 1616. These barriers are mentioned in a letter from John Chamberlain to Sir Dudley Carlton (12 October 1616).

The Prince's Creation is appointed to be the 4th of the next month; with much Tilting, Barriers and a Masque by the Inns of Court.<sup>39</sup>

Middleton also gives an account of how 'fortie worthie Gentlemen of the Noble Societies of Innes of Court, being tenne of each House' engaged 'to breake three staves, three swords, and exchange ten blowes apeece'.<sup>40</sup> So Field can be found firmly associated with the leading Kings Men, Heminges, Condell and Burbage in November 1616. He must also have been in rehearsal for *The Mad Lover* at this period since Lady Anne Clifford saw the King's Men perform this play at court on 5 January 1617 and Field's name appears on its actor list.<sup>41</sup>

It is a plausible hypothesis first proposed by Baldwin, that Field took over Shakespeare's shares in the King's Men.<sup>42</sup> He is not one of the shareholders named in the Ostler-Heminges lawsuit of 1615-16 but by 28 April 1619, in the Witter-Heminges lawsuit, he has become a shareholder.<sup>43</sup> Field's name appears on four King's Men actor lists and he made substantial written contribution to two of their plays, *The Queen of Corinth* and *The*

*Knight of Malta*.<sup>44</sup> His important collaboration with Massinger, *The Fatal Dowry*, was written for, and performed by the King's Men.<sup>45</sup> Field is listed as one of the principal actors in Shakespeare's plays. He is associated with Burbage in contemporary references, and allusions connect him with plays in the King's Men's repertory.<sup>46</sup> Since we do not know exactly when Field died we cannot say whether he stayed with the King's Men until his death. His name appears on the King's Men's patent of 27 March 1619 and on their livery list of 19 May 1619. The next legal evidence we have concerning Field is dated 2 August 1620 when letters of administration were granted to his oldest surviving relative, his sister Dorcas Rice.<sup>47</sup>

The precise date of Field's death is unknown, nor do we know anything about its causes. We may assume that he was still alive on 24 May 1619 when Thomas Larkin wrote to Sir Thomas Pickering that 'Field the player's brother shall succeed Llandaff'.<sup>48</sup> Sometime between 5 and 15 June 1619 Sir William Trumbull in a letter to Lord Hay, quoted gossip about Field and Lady Argyll.<sup>49</sup> Both correspondents write as if Field is still alive and actively involved in the theatre. Surely his recent death would have been a topic of conversation and would have been mentioned in such letters. Certainly Field was then very well known, famous enough to be the subject of John Taylor's 'Quiblet'.<sup>50</sup> But between June 1619 and August 1620 there is no record of Field at all. It may be significant that *Philaster; or Love lies a Bleeding*, a play in which Field made a great impression, was performed at court in the winter of 1619/20, before being published in quarto in 1620.<sup>51</sup> It is tempting to think that it was the death of Field that persuaded the King's Men into publishing the play, but the suggestion is mere speculation. *Philaster* was in the active repertory of the King's Men throughout Field's time with the company and continued to be popular for the next ten years or so.



There is one further piece of analogous evidence that suggests that Field did not die in August 1619 as both Brinkley and Peery suggest (Brinkley, p.44; Peery, pp.22-23). When, on the death of his brother Nathaniel Field, letters of administration were granted for his estate, the gap between his burial and the completion of legal formalities was approximately three weeks.<sup>52</sup> Admittedly this was a few years later and the recipient of the letters of administration was Nathaniel's widow, not his sister. Yet even granted additional delays it seems to me that the lapse of more than a year between death and letters of administration is excessive, even for those litigious times.

Brinkley takes as evidence for Field's death in or before August 1619 the omission of his name from those allocated on the *Sir John van Olden Barnavelt* manuscript which can be securely dated on the basis of two letters, August 1619 (*Jac. and Car. Stage*, III, 415-117). The play manuscript does not support Brinkley's view. Only the players of the minor parts are named therein. None of the major roles is assigned and many of those we know certainly to have been alive are not included. The absence of Field's name is, therefore, neither notable or significant. Though I favour a date for his death in the summer of 1620 the paucity of evidence makes it impossible to say more than that he was still alive in the early summer of 1619 and dead by the summer of 1620.

(ii)

What sort of a man was Nathan Field? He was clearly an educated man. I think Peery is mistaken in his judgement of Field as 'a high spirited unacademic youth' (Peery, p.16). There is no doubt that he received a good education at St Paul's School. He came from a cultivated and literate family. His father, a well known Puritan preacher, was an Oxford man who

published many religious treatises, sermons and tracts, both his own and his translations from the French. His brother Nathaniel was a publisher, his brother Theophilus a bishop. Theophilus received degrees from Cambridge and Oxford before becoming Bishop of Llandaff, Bishop of St David's and finally Bishop of Hereford.<sup>53</sup> More significantly, Field's plays show evidence of classical learning. They contain detailed classical allusions and quotations from Latin texts. Some stage directions are written in Latin. He exploits his knowledge of the etymology of words. His first play *A Woman is a Weathercock* has a quotation from a Juvenal satire as an epigraph, and a joke in Field's front matter to the same edition depends on his being well known for his use of Latin. Addressing 'any Woman that hath beene no Weather-Cocke' he concludes

If she have beene constant, and be so, all I will expect from her for my paynes, is, that she will continue so, but till my next Play be printed, wherein she shall see what amendes I have made to her, and all the sex, and so I end my Epistle, without a Latine sentence.

(*Weathercock*, Q.1612, [A3])

The sources used in his plays indicate a wide range of reading. The gracefulness of his commendatory verses shows a command of literary style. An example is his 'To my lov'd friend M. John Fletcher on his Pastorall', which appears in the front matter of *The Faithful Shepherdess*, dated from 1609.<sup>54</sup>

Field certainly kept up with his Latin after he left St Paul's School. Jonson told Drummond that

Nid Field was his Schollar and he had read to him the Satyres of Horace & some Epigrammes of Martial.<sup>55</sup>

It is on the basis of this quotation alone that Brinkley writes



Even though only a child of thirteen years, he pored over his Latin during the time in which the other Chapel children were probably playing. He was sufficiently earnest to attract the aid of Ben Jonson.

(Brinkley, pp.15-16)

This seems to me over-sentimental, especially since there is no indication in Jonson's statement as to when the readings occurred. Field and Jonson seem to have been friends. Bibliographic evidence shows that Field's commendatory verses for *Volpone* were a late addition to the 1607 quarto and Field's lines make Jonson's personal insistence on Field's participation clear (Herford and Simpson, V.5).

How can my common knowledge set you forth,  
When it wants art, and *Art* itselfe wants worth?  
Therefore, how-vaine (although by you, made one)  
Am I to put such saucy bold muse on  
To send you *Verses*...  
...you'd let my pen, with theirs, be showne.

Herford and Simpson, commenting on the 'modest tone' of Field's lines for *Volpone*, write that they have

something of the youthful, almost boyish note which charms us in his writings. It adds a new and kindly glimpse to what we know of his relations with Jonson, that the great dramatist, amid the homage paid to a brilliant and successful play, sought the tribute of the young actor who revered him.

(Herford and Simpson, V, 6)

Again I think the case is overstated, though it must be admitted that the title of the poem 'To the worthiest Maister Jonson' does lend itself to this interpretation. It is a pity that one cannot place more confidence in the

sincerity of poems published in these contexts since the greater intimacy of the title of Field's verses to *Catiline* two years later seems to indicate a development in their relationship. This time they are addressed 'To his worthy beloued friend Mr. Ben Ionson' (Herford and Simpson, I, p.160).<sup>56</sup> Field was obviously an educated man, a friend of educated men.

Another playwright known to Field was George Chapman. Field acted in virtually all his plays, notably as Bussy D'Ambois, and Chapman addressed verses 'To his loved Sonne and his Wether-cocke woman'.<sup>57</sup> A letter recently transcribed by Albert Tricomi may indicate that Field was also friendly with George Chapman's brother Thomas. Requesting 'good counsell and comferte' for his 'poure distressed friendes in these sorrowful dayes' the writer asks that his letters 'to doctor lodge and Mr Field' should be delivered as soon as possible. The letter is headed with the address of the Chapman family home in Hitchin.<sup>58</sup>

Among Field's professional acquaintances there are a number who turn up regularly throughout his working life. Chief among these are John Underwood, Robert Benfield, William Ecclestone and Joseph Taylor. Field's professional association with Underwood goes back to childhood when they both appeared in *Cynthia's Revels* and *Poetaster*. They continued to work together for the next eight years or so until Underwood left the Children's Company in about 1609-10 to join the King's Men. Later, when Field himself joined King's they met again, sharing the stage in *The Knight of Malta*, *The Queen of Corinth* and *The Loyal Subject*, and in the plays of Shakespeare. Underwood played Bonario and Dapper to Field's Voltore and Face.

Another player with whom Field appeared at King's was William Ecclestone. They had known each other previously when, as Lady Elizabeth's Men, they had both been in *The Honest Man's Fortune*, 'plaide in the yeare 1613'. Robert Benfield, a colleague from *The Coxcomb* and *The Honest Man's Fortune* was also at King's during Field's membership of that



company, playing Lovewit to his Face. Joseph Taylor was a colleague from the Lady Elizabeth's Men. A founder member of the group he stayed with them right up to its reorganisation. Taylor later joined the King's Men. He, like Field, is listed as one of 'the principall actors in all these plays'.<sup>59</sup>

It was to defend these friends and other colleagues that Field wrote his attack on Mr Thomas Sutton, the preacher at St Mary Overy, Southwark.<sup>60</sup> He had not only denounced plays and players from the pulpit but had attacked Field personally. Field's reply is skilfully argued. There were no players 'in the olde world or ... in the tyme of the patriarkes, judges, kinges and prophetes' and so, says Sutton, they must be damned. But Field answers, there were no smiths either. 'Are all smiths therefore damned? - a sinfull conclucion!' In an elegant refutation of Sutton's assertion that Caesar banished players Field points out that James I, 'our Caesar, our David'...'holdes it no execrable matter to tollerate them' and that it is 'ungodly' to 'say that he mayntaynes those whom God hath damned'. He disposes of Sutton's final argument, that a woman became possessed of the Devil at the Playhouse 'upon his owne ground' by a witty refusal to accept the Devil's testimony.

God deliver me from an argument soe polluted, or an  
imaginacion soe abominable.

The relaxed and urbane tone of Field's refutation must not obscure his faith in God and his belief in his profession

which a state soe Christian and soe provident are pleased to  
spare, and none repines att but some few whose curiosity  
overwayes their charity.

Chambers' assertion that Field's 'moral character was hardly becoming to the

son of a preacher' (*Eliz. Stage*, II, 317) seems to ignore Field's purposeful defence, on sound Biblical grounds, of his profession. I find it equally hard to accept the view of Field put forward by Peery.

His unsettled life had cut him off from any deep roots such as love of country, the home or conventional domestic virtues; it had not given him the schooling of a man of letters.

(Peery, p.13)

Peery and Chambers seem unduly influenced in their views by evidence, albeit mere gossip, of Field's liaison with one, if not two, married women. In June 1619 William Trumbull reporting all the latest *on dits* from England noted that the Earl of Argyll

was privy to the paiment of 15 or 16 poundes sterling to one of your lordships Trayne called Wisedome for the noursing of a childe which the world sayes is daughter to my Lady (Argyll) and N(at.) Field the Player.<sup>61</sup>

The story receives a certain kind of support from an epigram in a manuscript in the Ashmolean, entitled

On Nathaniel Field, suspected for too much familiarity with my Lady May.<sup>62</sup>

If one assumes that Nathaniel is a late error for Nathan, and that the poem refers to the player rather than the publisher - and this certainly seems more plausible - then this second piece of hearsay complements the first. But there is no real evidence of a liaison between Judith May and Nathan Field and the ease with which their names lend themselves to punning epigrams seems in itself to make the poem's testimony very weak indeed. The Dulwich portrait shows that Field, if indeed it is he, was an attractive man. He has been



painted with his hand over his heart in the traditional pose of a lover but whether or not this reflects Field's character, or, perhaps, the roles he played, is open to doubt. He was certainly a shrewd man. In his dealings with 'Father Hinchlowe' he shows himself a skilful politician, successful in achieving what he wants. One example must serve. His letter about Daborne's play, for which he has been negotiating on behalf of the company, is relaxed and persuasive:

Mr Dawborne and J, have spent a great deale of time in conference about this plott, wch will make as beneficiall a play as hath come these seaven yeares. It is out of his loue he detaines it for us, onely xl is desir'd in hand ... wee would not loose it, wee have so assured a hope of it, and, on my knowledge Mr Dawborne may haue his request of another Companie. pray let vs haue speedie answere and effectual you know, the last money you disburst was justly pay'd in ... I rest  
your louing and obedient Son: Nat: Field.

*(Henslowe Papers, p.84)*

The picture of Field that emerges from this biographical account is of an educated and devout man, proud of his profession and competent in business. His range of experience is wide - from prison to Court. His knowledge of playing spaces is similarly extensive from the Hope that doubled as an animal baiting arena to Whitehall before the King.

(iii)

In trying to trace Field's career as a professional actor I have been struck by two things, the paucity of information and the extraordinary variety of his work. For someone who was talked about in the same terms as Burbage we know surprisingly little about his actual roles. We know certainly that he

played Face in *The Alchemist* and Voltore in *Volpone*, and it is virtually certain that he played Philaster.<sup>63</sup> He definitely played Bussy D'Ambois, probably in both Chapman's original play and its sequel.<sup>64</sup> It is very likely that he appeared as Humphrey in *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* and Littlewit in *Bartholomew Fair*.<sup>65</sup> Field's name appears on ten actor lists so we know some of the plays in which he performed, even if we cannot assign definite parts to him. In addition to his appearances in *Cynthia's Revels*, *Poetaster* and *Epicoene* Field acted in *The Coxcomb* and *The Honest Man's Fortune*. He is one of the names on the Shakespeare First Folio list and he also appeared in *The Mad Lover*, *The Loyal Subject*, *The Queen of Corinth* and *The Knight of Malta*.<sup>66</sup> One should, presumably, add Field's own writings to this list: there are excellent parts for him in all his plays.

In the account that follows I have presented the results of my investigations in a roughly chronological order arranged by company. I had hoped that this would allow trends to emerge, but the random and sketchy nature of the available information has prevented this. However, it has still been possible to conclude that Field had a huge range of acting demands made upon him by the variety of the repertories of the companies for whom he worked.

Field began his professional career at the end of 1600 and his first appearance at court was almost certainly on 6 January 1601. The play was Jonson's *Cynthia's Revels*. We know from the actor list that Field was in this show. Nathaniel Giles was paid for a 'showe w[i]th musycke and special songes prepared for the purpose': Giles was manager of the Children's Company. Field may well have been one of the three children who in the quarto's energetic version 'enter struggling'. Two of them can be identified as Pavy and either Underwood or Frost. Child 3, Sal [Pavy] says he is going to play Anaides but there is no other indication of casting. Perhaps Field played Amorphus. The following year, as the actor list indicates, Field appeared in



*Poetaster*, but I can assign no particular part to him.

I feel reasonably confident that Field played Humphrey in Beaumont's *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*, performed by the Children's Company in 1607, since his presence on stage in this part would give point to an otherwise weak and irrelevant joke. The Wife asks Humphrey

I pray you brother, with your favour, were you never none of  
Master Monkester's scholars?

(*The Knight*, I.i.95)

In a footnote to this speech in his recent edition of the play Sheldon Zitner writes

Although there is no evidence for Mulcaster's active connection with the Children of Paul's (a troupe revived a year after his becoming a master there, and subsiding a year before his resignation), the Wife might have thought it the case. Her gaffe may have been to mistake *The Knight* actors for their declining rivals.... Moreover the gaffe would have been given further point by the Blackfriars troupe's impressment of Paul's boys into service as actors at various times after 1600.<sup>67</sup>

The joke would surely have been funnier were the remark to be addressed to one of those impressed. Nathan Field was 'a scholler of a gramer schole in London kepte by one Mr Monkaster' when he was taken into the Children of the Chapel Company. It is this group who performed the play.

Field's name appears on the actor list of another of the 'Beaumont and Fletcher' plays, *The Coxcomb*, which would have been performed at about the same time as *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*.

During Field's time with the Children of the Chapel he also appeared in many of Chapman's plays. *The Gentleman Usher* (1602), *May Day* (1602), *Sir Giles Goosecap* (1602), *Monsieur D'Olive* (1604) and *The*

*Widow's Tears* (1605) were all presented by this company. They performed his troublesome *Biron* (160<sup>8</sup>~~2~~) plays. Marston was also writing for them, his *The Dutch Courtesan* (1604) being a particular favourite. Daniel's *Philotas* (1604), Day's *The Isle of Gulls* (1606), and *Eastward Ho* (1605) created problems for the company but *Eastward Ho* at least continued in the repertoire. Field would surely have appeared in his own *A Woman is a Weathercock* (1609/10) and *Amends for Ladies* (1611), perhaps playing Neville and Bould. *The Insatiate Countess* (1610) and *The Scornful Lady* (1613) also belong to this time, as does Middleton's *A Trick to Catch the Old One* (1605).

Almost coincidentally with appearing in *A Woman is a Weathercock*, Field took the stage in Jonson's *Epicoene* (1609) as again we know from the actor list. It is a plausible speculation that he played either Dauphine or Truewit, the parts of Morose and Sir Amorous LaFoole being confidently assigned to William Barksted and Hugh Attwell respectively (Riddell, p.285 and pp.295-6).

One other aspect of Field's career as a young actor requires comment and that is his work in pageants and entertainments. Strong presumptive evidence connects him with the triumph for Sir Thomas Lowe in 1604, performed by some of the Children. Ben Jonson made the 'device and speech' for them to welcome the new Lord Mayor, and Thomas Kendall, a partner in the company, was paid twenty two pounds 'for furnishing the Children w[i]th apparrell and other things needful for the shewe'. These included a lion, a galley, mermaids and a chariot. An entertainment prepared by Jonson at Theobalds on 22 May 1607 led to Thomas Kendall again being paid 'for the boyes' (McMillin, p.158).

In the following year on 5 and 6 May and on 11 May 1608 there was a splendid entertainment at Salisbury House. Arrangements were made 'for



the showe' and 'adorning the lybrary against the kings coming thether'. Among payments made on this occasion were ones to 'Allen', Inigo Jones and a Juggler. Ben Jonson devised the show which involved 'two boys that played Fancy and Barahon', eight spirits and a conjuror's 'glasses'. Field may well have taken part in some capacity (McMillin, p.159).

We know without doubt that Field and Jonson were both involved in another enterainment for James I at the opening of 'Britains Burse'. This was presented on 11 April 1609. Between the 14th and the 16th April payments were made to John Taillor for 'divers Indyan toyes', to Henry Elmes, Inigo Jones, Ben Jonson, William Ostler 'the player', his boy (Giles Carey) and 'Feild the key keeper'. An additional note states that money was owed to

Mr Johnson's man and Feld that satt up all night wryting the speeches, songes and inscriptions.

In his discussion of this note Scott McMillin writes

If being Jonson's protégé allowed Field to perform in an entertainment before the King, it might also have entailed more pedantic tasks.

(McMillin, p.161)

He infers that Field's job was that of a copyist, and the text certainly allows that interpretation. However it is just possible that Field, like Shakespeare a few years later, was actually involved in devising impresas for shields and mottos.<sup>68</sup> One wonders just what these inscriptions were for. The costume bill indicates parts in the entertainment for the 'Key Keeper, the shop mr and the Prentise' and we know from the bills of payment to the performers that they were played by Field, Ostler and Carey respectively. What speeches and songs did Field write for them? Did the shop, or shops, carry inscriptions?

Unfortunately the situation is frustratingly confused. However, it is not unlikely that Field should be entrusted with writing songs, speeches, and inscriptions since it was at Jonson's personal insistence that he wrote verses for *Volpone* two years earlier.

Littlewit, the puppet master of *Bartholomew Fair*, is another part that can be assigned with reasonable plausibility to Field. We know that he appeared in this play in the Autumn of 1614.<sup>69</sup> The self reflexive nature of the puppets' episode reinforces comic points which can only be fully appreciated if Field were appearing in person. Cokes asks the puppet master

Which is your Burbage now?

*Lea.* What mean you by that, sir?

*Cok.* Your best actor. Your Field?

*Lit.* Good, i' faith! You are even with me, sir.

*Lea.* This is he that acts young Leander, sir. He is extremely belov'd of the womenkind, they do so affect his action, the great gamesters that come here.

(*Bartholomew Fair*, V.3.79)

This episode forms part of a sequence which W.J.Lawrence describes as 'a quaint old playhouse trick' in which characters on stage refer to the actors playing them.<sup>70</sup> Keith Sturges takes the point further. He comments that Jonson here 'pays tribute to his former pupil registering Field's high standing in the profession by comparing him with Burbage'. He continues

there was a bonus for the playwright in that the actor's father, it was well known, was John Field, a puritan preacher of the 1570s and 1580s.... For the Puritan attack on the puppets, Jonson writes a clever pastiche contrived out of a famous admission of defeat by Field...together with a prophecy from Giles Wigginton, another reformer.

(Sturges, p.173)

Jonson's allusive recreation of writings by Field and Wigginton in the mouth



no italics

of *Zeal of the Land Busy* is comic enough. With Nathan Field on stage acting Littlewit the situation is funnier. Another play in which Field appeared at this time was his own *The Honest Man's Fortune*: his name appears on the actor list. Perhaps he played Montague, the best male role. The Lady Elizabeth's men took over and continued to play many of the Children's Company's plays. *The Coxcomb* and *The Dutch Courtesan* continued to be popular. *Eastward Ho*, *The Chaste Maid of Cheapside* and *Cupid's Revenge* were included in their regular repertoire along with Field's own work.<sup>71</sup>

The most exciting repertory of the period belonged, of course, to the King's Men. In addition to the plays of Shakespeare, they had work as varied as *Mucedorus*, *Sejanus* and *The London Prodigal*. While Field was a member the King's Men performed *Twelfth Night*, *The Winter's Tale* and *The Merry Devil of Edmonton* at Court. During this period he may have played Euphanes in *The Queen of Corinth*, Miranda in *The Knight of Malta*, Polydore in *The Mad Lover*, Thierry in *Thierry and Theodoret* and Young Archas in *The Loyal Subject* as Baldwin claims. These are certainly in keeping with parts we know he played but, since versatility rather than the notion of 'lines' seems to govern the lives of Elizabethan players, such assignments can only be speculative (Baldwin, p.204 and *passim*).

While he was a member of King's Field also appeared in *Philaster*. One can perhaps infer something about his style, and, perhaps, something about his other acting roles, from the contrast implicit in the exchanges between Sir Cupid Phantsy and Clyster which I cited earlier.

Cly: What so lowd and acting as if *Burbedge's* soule had  
newly reviv'd *Hamlett*, & *Jeronimo* againe, or *Allen*,  
*Tamberlayne*?

Ph: Nay, Sir, rather Feild, in *Love Lyes a bleeding*.

(*Wit's Triumvirate*, IV.4 )



The implication is surely that just as Burbage and Alleyn play the eponymous heroes of their plays, so does Field. Surely, too, Field's quieter, modern, perhaps, more romantic, style is here opposed to a louder more hectoring one. This would be in line with two parts - though neither of them remotely romantic - which we know that he played while he was at King's - Voltore in *Volpone* and Face in *The Alchemist* (Riddell, pp.293-94).

The evidence of Field's playing of these two roles was in a recently discovered copy of Ben Jonson's first folio in which hand written names annotate some of the characters in three of the plays, *Epicoene*, *Volpone* and *The Alchemist*. The performances these lists record, at least of *Volpone* and *The Alchemist* must, to judge from the personnel involved, have been revivals. Both these plays were first performed by the King's Men before Field joined the company. Since both he and Burbage appear on the lists the revivals must be dated sometime before 16 March 1618/19 when Burbage was buried and after 1615/16 when Field became a King's Man. The rest of the allocations are consonant with this dating. Field was cast in the fascinating pairing of Voltore and Face, parts which call for speed, and versatility. Richard Burbage, not unexpectedly, played *Volpone* and *Subtle*, Henry Condell played *Mosca* and *Surly*, and John Lowin played *Politic Wouldbe* and *Epicure Mammon*. Field's allocation of parts is interesting. Though he plays Face he does not also do the similar role of *Mosca*. Instead he is given Voltore, a smaller but challenging role. It is notable that he does not play young parts. Presumably the relative smallness of the roles of Bonario and Dapper or Kastril has something to do with this. But the casting does not confirm that Field always played dashing young lovers, as Baldwin surmises.

Nathan Field's is one of twenty six names chosen by Heminges and Condell to preface their First Folio. The reasons for their choice are not immediately obvious. Many more could have been admitted. Inclusion is



not limited to the creators of roles: many of those on the list joined the company after Shakespeare's retirement and death. One would like to think that Heminges and Condell were selecting the best actors over the period by including them on their roll of honour but it is more likely that the motive was financial. All had been sharers at one time or another. Though some of the roles in Shakespeare's plays can be definitely assigned there is no evidence connecting Field with any specific parts. Reluctantly one must be suspicious of J.P.Collier's proposition that Field played Othello. He records an epigram 'De Agello et De Othello'

Field is in sooth an actor - all men know it  
And is the true Othello of the poet...

but the source he cites is a manuscript which, according to Chambers, 'it would be dangerous to regard...as genuine'.<sup>72</sup> In any case part of the joke depends on Field's being a married man, the assumption current at the time Collier was writing, before the Nathan-Nathaniel confusion had been unravelled. Additionally Richard Burbage is known to have played Othello with considerable success and he was still active during almost all of Field's tenure at King's. Iago is a more likely part for an actor who also played Face.

Field presumably wrote a good part for himself in *The Fatal Dowry* on which he collaborated with Massinger. Novall Junior with its entertaining comedy to add to its villainy would offer him more than Charalois.<sup>73</sup> Field was the original Bussy D'Ambois as the prologue first printed in 1641 claims: 'Field is gone, Whose Action first did give it name...'.<sup>74</sup> We do not know the date of this renowned performance. First printed in 1607, 'as it hath been often presented at Paules', the play belonged eventually to the King's Men. It is possible that it was, like all of Chapman's other plays of the period, originally written for the Queen's Revels' Children and that it moved with



Kirkham to Paul's Boys in 1605/6. Wren has suggested that there may have been a certain amount of mingling of the boys' companies at that time.<sup>75</sup> Nicholas Brooke suggests that Field revived the play sometime between 1610 and 1616 when he also staged its sequel, *The Revenge of Bussy D'Ambois*, and that it was Field who 'took it with him to the King's Men for whom he played till his death in 1619' (Brooke, p.liv). A connection with Lady Elizabeth's Men has also been made by John Freehafer, who claims that the Prologue printed with the play's third quarto was written for a 1622 performance by that company, and not by the King's Men.<sup>76</sup> He thus associates *Bussy D'Ambois* with other plays from the Lady Elizabeth's repertoire which came eventually, and illicitly, to the King's Men. The play, then, can be associated with all the companies for whom Field worked. All we know for certain from the prologue is that Field played Bussy but we have no idea when.

One further point needs clearing up. An engraving from the Enthoven Collection has as its title 'Nathaniel Field as the heroine in Kyd's Spanish Tragedy'. It is unlikely that this is true. Admittedly *The Spanish Tragedy* was in the repertory of the Children's company. Field clearly knows the play well enough to quote from it and to parody one scene in his own work. But several factors make it almost impossible that the attribution is accurate. There is absolutely no evidence to suggest that Field ever played female roles. The engraving itself is of little authority, deriving from the title page illustration to the 1615 quarto of the play printed by W.White, and sold by J.White and T.Langley.<sup>77</sup> This woodcut was carried on each of the next three editions of the play.<sup>78</sup> None has any title or attribution. Nothing in this woodcut's bibliographic history connects it with Nathan Field, or with the companies for which he acted. He was not likely to be playing a woman in 1615 when he was twenty eight. The Dulwich portrait shows him with a



moustache. Another version of the scene on the woodcut accompanies a ballad based on the play.

The Spanish Tragedy  
Containing the lamentable Murder of Horatio and Bellimperia:  
with the Pitiful Death of Old Hieronimo. To the Tune of Queen  
Dido.

This was published, probably in 1620, by and for Henry Gosson.<sup>79</sup>  
Again there is no link with or mention of Field

The illustration in the 1615 quarto cannot refer directly to an actual performance. Different moments from II.4 are conflated so that Hieronimo's discovery of his son's body and Belimperia's earlier shout for help are presented simultaneously. At the same time Lorenzo's evil nature is exaggerated by his being presented as a Moor.

The title on the engraving seems to have been added by Gabrielle Enthoven herself, stemming from a cutting for which she, frustratingly, gives no source. It is difficult to see on what authority she bases her attribution and I can only conclude that in this case supposition is posing as fact.<sup>80</sup>

Despite the arbitrary and trivial nature of many of the fragments that make up this picture of Field, its outlines are clear enough. He was a complete man of the theatre. He was a persuasive advocate for his profession and a poet whose verses were thought to confer status on Jonson's published plays. He was a prolific playwright. He was a businessman whose financial interests involved all aspects of theatre management. In his twenty year career as a player he performed in many different circumstances. Richard Dutton has pointed out that 'as

shareholder, actor and resident dramatist in the company [Shakespeare] held three roles in a virtually unique combination'. He adds to this list Thomas Heywood.<sup>81</sup> Another name for consideration must be Nathan Field's. Lack of documentary evidence has impeded full assessment of his importance as shareholder and actor but Field has left a body of writing for discussion. I move next to the identification of Field's plays and scenes so that his significance as a writer for the theatre can be reconsidered. Variety and flexibility are the keynotes of Field's career: they are also the characteristics of his writing.



## NOTES

1. Any work on Field must be indebted to Brinkley's 1928 monograph but there is some new information to be added and some of her conclusions need reconsideration. I have included here those details of Field's life that I find relevant to his work as a playwright. For other biographical accounts see E.Verhasselt 'A biography of Nathan Field, Dramatist and Actor', *Revue Belge de philologie et d'histoire*, 25 (1946-7), 485-508, which merely repeats Brinkley's account, and Irby B.Cauthen, Jr., 'Nathan Field', in *Jacobean and Caroline Dramatists*, edited by Fredson Bowers, *Dictionary of Literary Biography*, 58 (Detroit, 1987), pp.86-90.
2. See, for example, G.L.Hosking, *The Life and Times of Edward Alleyn* (London, 1952); G.E.Bentley, *The Profession of Player in Shakespeare's Time, 1590-1642* (Princeton, 1984); Andrew Gurr, *Playgoing in Shakespeare's London* (Cambridge, 1987).
3. Conclusions about Elizabethan acting style have covered the full spectrum from 'formal' to 'naturalistic'. They have been reached by, among others, Joseph, Rosenberg, Downer and Seltzer. The situation is complicated in Field's case by his being a member of a children's company, though not, as far as I have been able to ascertain, a boy 'actress'. Boy actors on public and private stages have been studied by, among others, Jamieson, Foakes, Streett, Jensen, Shapiro and Gair: Bertram Joseph, *Elizabethan Acting* (London, 1951; 2nd edition, 1964); Marvin Rosenberg 'Elizabethan Actors: Men or Marionettes', *PMLA*, 69 (1954), 915-27; Alan Downer, 'Prolegomenon to the Study of Elizabethan Acting', *Maske und Kothurn*, 10 (1964), 625-36; Daniel Seltzer, 'The Actors and Staging', in *A New Companion to Shakespeare Studies*, edited by Kenneth Muir and S.Schoenbaum (Cambridge, 1971), pp.35-54; Michael Jamieson, 'Shakespeare's Celibate Stage', in *The Seventeenth Century Stage*, edited by G.E.Bentley, *Patterns of Literary Criticism* (Chicago, 1968), pp.70-93; R.A.Foakes, 'Tragedy of the Children's Theatres after 1600: A Challenge to the Adult Stage', in *Elizabethan Theatre II*, edited by David Galloway (Toronto, 1970), pp.37-59; J.G.B.Streett, 'Some Aspects of the Influence of the boy-actress convention on the plays of Shakespeare and some of his contemporary dramatists' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oxford, 1974); Ejner J.Jensen, 'The boy actors: plays and playing', *RORD*, 18 (1975), 5-11; Michael Shapiro, *Children of the Revels: The Boy Companies of Shakespeare's Time and Their Plays* (New York, 1977); W.Reavley Gair, *The Children of Paul's: the Story of a Theatre Company, 1553-1608* (Cambridge, 1982); Ann Blake, "'The Humour of Children": John Marston's Plays in the Private Theatres', *RES*, ns. 38 (1987), 471-82.
4. Thomas Middleton (?), *Father Hubbard's Tale* (London, 1604), Dlr, cited by Gurr, p.218.



5. Brinkley, pp.19-20; F.G.Fleay, *A Chronicle History of the London Stage, 1559-1642* (London, 1890), p.211 and p.230.
6. Fleay prints the text of Clifton's complaint, pp.127-132; Brinkley, pp.18-19. See also James H.Forse, 'Extortion in the name of Art in Elizabethan England: The Impressment of Thomas Clifton for the Queen's Chapel Boys', *Theatre Survey*, 31 (1990), 165-76; Document 24 in Irwin Smith, *Shakespeare's Blackfriars Playhouse: Its History and its Design* (New York, 1964), pp.484-86.
7. Clifton attended the school at Christchurch, and Chappel, one run by a Mr Spykes near Cripplegate. John Mottram was at Westminster School. The rest were apprentices.
8. For a discussion of Richard Mulcaster see Foster Watson, *The English Grammar School to 1660* (Cambridge, 1908; reprinted, London, 1968), pp.210-212 and 324, and T.H.Vail Motter, *The School Drama in England* (London, 1929), p.130 and pp.280-81.
9. For this and other examples see Paula Johnson, 'Jacobean Ephemera and the Immortal Word', *Renaissance Drama*, ns 8 (1977), 157-71.
10. William Shakespeare, *Hamlet, The First Quarto 1603*, edited by Albert B.Weiner (New York, 1962), ll2.262.
11. *Eliz. Stage*, II, 23-61; H.N.Hillebrand, *The Child Actors; A Chapter in Elizabethan Stage History* (Urbana, 1926).
12. Brinkley, p.26; T.Birch, *The Court and Times of James the First* (London, 1848), 1, 61; *Eliz. Stage*, III, 286; Hillebrand, p.194; Peery, p.10.
13. 'Four letters on Theatrical Affairs', edited by E.K.Chambers, in *Collections*, Malone Society (Oxford, 1923), II, Part 2, pp.145-9 (pp.148-9).
14. Fleay, p.222; Hillebrand, p.201.
15. A letter, thought to be by Chapman, was written to the Duke of Lennox's secretary at the time of the troubles. George Chapman, *The Conspiracy and Tragedy of Byron*, edited by John Margeson, *The Revels Plays* (Manchester, 1988), Appendix 11b. p.278.
16. At Christmas 1608 the Children of Blackfriars performed an unnamed play for the King. On 1 January 1608/9 Middleton's *A Trick to Catch the Old One*, and on 4 January another unnamed play were presented by the same company. *Jacobean and Caroline Revels Accounts, 1603-1642*, edited by W.R.Streitberger, Malone Society Collections, 13 (Oxford, 1986), p.31; *Dramatic Records in the Declared Accounts of the Office of Works, 1560-1640*, edited by F.P.Wilson and R.F.Hill, Malone Society



Collections, 10 (Oxford, 1975) (1977), p.21. These publications will be abbreviated MSC 13, and MSC 10, in what follows. Between Christmas and Shrovetide 1609/10 five plays were presented by the Children of the Whitefriars for the King and the Prince. MSC 10, p.22. *Dramatic Records in the Declared Accounts of the Treasurer of the Chamber, 1558-1642*, edited by David Cook and F.P.Wilson, Malone Society Collections, 6 (Oxford, 1962), p.49. This publication will be abbreviated MSC 6 in what follows. MSC 13, p.36. In the season 1610-11 the Children of the Queen's Revels appeared at court in unnamed plays on 13 December, 2 February, and 14 April 1611. MSC 13, p.42, MSC 10 p.23. This last is not recorded by Chambers and materially affects the dating of *A Woman is a Weathercock* which sometime before its publication in 1612 was presented before the King in Whitehall. For further discussion of this point, see Chapter Two. See also Scott McMillin, 'Jonson's Early Entertainments from Hatfield House', *Renaissance Drama*, ns 1 (1968), 154-59, for the Children's Company's involvement in royal entertainments in May 1608 and April 1609.

17. 'Dramatic Records from the Patent Rolls Company Licences', edited by E.K.Chambers and W.W.Greg in *Collections*, Malone Society (Oxford, 1909) I, Part 3, pp.260-284 (pp.271-2). Hereafter MSC I, Part 3; Brinkley, p.29.
18. 'Keysar vs Burbage et al', C.W.Wallace, *Shakespeare and his London Associates as revealed in recently discovered documents* (Lincoln, Nebraska, 1910), p.81 and p.83; Brinkley, p.27 and p.28.
19. MSC 13, p.31 and p.36; MSC 10, p.22; MSC 6, p.47 and p.49.
20. MSC 13, p.42, pp.47-48, pp.55-56; John Tucker Murray, *English Dramatic Companies, 1588-1642*, 2 vols (London, 1910), 1, 363; *Eliz. Stage*, p.223.
21. Field negotiates with Daborne on behalf of the company for a play, appears as leader of players in their complaints against Henslowe, and is the court payee for *Bartholomew Fair*, performed at court 1 November 1614 and paid 11 June 1615. MSC 13, p.68; MSC 6, p.60; *Henslowe Papers: Being Documents Supplementary to Henslowe's Diary*, edited by W.W.Greg (London, 1907), p.86; hereafter *Henslowe Papers*. MSC 10, p.25.
22. The Lady Elizabeth's Men can be found in Norwich, Bristol, Marlborough and Kent and then in Coventry. See *Norwich 1540-1642*, edited by David Galloway, *Records of Early English Drama* (Toronto, Buffalo and London, 1984), p.138. This publication will be abbreviated REED Norwich in what follows. Murray, II, p.4; *Records of Plays and Players in Kent, 1450-1642*, edited by Giles E.Dawson, Malone Society Collection 7 (Oxford, 1965), p.65, p.19, p.50, p.117. This publication will be abbreviated MSC 7 in what follows. *Coventry*, edited by



- R.W.Ingram, *Records of Early English Drama* (Toronto and Buffalo, 1981), pp.393-4. This publication will be abbreviated *REED* Coventry in what follows. I have examined all the material published by *Records of Early English Drama* and the *Malone Society Collections* up to the date of writing (August 1990). These usefully supplement the work of Murray and *Eliz. Stage* but since not all counties are yet researched these remain the standard references.
23. *MSC* 10, p.25; *MSC* 6, p.60; *MSC* 13, p.68.
  24. *Eliz. Stage*, II, pp.448-71; *Jac. and Car. Stage*, VI, pp.200-214.
  25. Ben Jonson, *Bartholomew Fair*, edited by E.A.Horsman, *The Revels Plays* (London, 1960), V.3.80.
  26. *Henslowe Papers*, Article 69, p.67; Article 68, pp.65-67, the famous tripartite letter, is endorsed for payment.
  27. For discussion of this see G.Chapman, B.Jonson and J.Marston, *Eastward Ho*, edited by R.W.Van Fossen, *The Revels Plays* (Manchester, 1979), p.39; *MSC* 6, p.58; *Eliz. Stage*, IV, 129.
  28. Keith Sturgess discusses the original conditions of this performance at Court in *Jacobean Private Theatre*, *Theatre Production Studies* (London, 1987), pp.167-89.
  29. Brinkley, p.31; *Eliz. Stage*, II, p.259; *Jac. and Car. Stage*, I, 176, 198.
  30. In November 1614 alone they had visited Coventry, Leicester, Nottingham and Coventry again within a period of a few days. Earlier in the same year they had been at Fordwich and Dover. *MSC* 7, p.78, p.50; *REED* Coventry, p.392, 389; Murray, II, 265; Murray, I, p.240.
  31. *MSC* 1, Part 3, pp.277-9; *Jac. and Car. Stage*, VI, pp.78-9.
  32. Brinkley, p.34; *Jac. and Car. Stage*, VI, p.85.
  33. *Eliz. Stage*, II 61; II, 259; II, 24-5.
  34. Murray, I, 263; Murray, II, 24-7; *REED* Coventry, p.397.
  35. *REED* Norwich, p.144; Murray II, 312, 376; Murray, I, 263; *REED* Coventry, p.397.
  36. *MSC* 7, p.50; *Records of Plays and Players in Norfolk and Suffolk, 1330-1642*, edited by David Galloway and John Wasson, *Malone Society Collections*, 11 (Oxford, 1980/1), p.158.



37. The murder on which the play was based was also the subject of a pamphlet entered in the Stationers' Register, 5 June 1616. The murderers were executed in May 1616. The topicality of the play would presumably be part of its appeal, so a date soon after the events it describes seems most plausible. *The Jeweller of Amsterdam* was entered on the Stationers' Register on 8 April 1654. *Jac. and Car. Stage*, III, 351-2; Andrew Clark, 'An Annotated List of Lost Domestic Plays, 1578-1624', *RORD*, 18 (1975), 29-44 (p.39).
38. Bodleian MS Eng. Poet. C II F72; *First Line Index of English Poetry, 1500-1800 in Manuscripts of the Bodleian Library, Oxford*, edited by Margaret Crum (Oxford, 1969), No. 533, p.128; Glynne Wickham, *Early English Stages, 1300-1660*, 3 vols (London, 1959-1981), II, Part 1, p.241. The poem itself is printed, but not discussed, in D.S.Bland, *Three Revels from the Inns of Court* (Avebury, 1984), p.63.
39. John Nichols, *The Progresses, Processions and Magnificent Festivities of King James the First*, 4 vols (London, 1828), III, 191; *The Letters of John Chamberlain*, edited by N.E.McClure, 2 vols (Philadelphia, 1939), II, 24-8.
40. There is an account of the Barriers in *Civitatis Amor*, in *The Works of Thomas Middleton*, edited by A.H.Bullen, 8 vols (London, 1886), VII, 267-90 (pp.280-81). The text of the entertainment is reprinted in Bland, pp.56-62.
41. MSC 13, p.75; *Diary of Lady Anne Clifford*, edited by V.Sackville-West (London, 1923), p.47.
42. T.W.Baldwin, *The Organization and Personnel of the Shakespearean Company* (New York, 1927), p.51.
43. Wallace, p.63 and his 'Shakespearean London', *The Times*, 2 October and 4 October 1909; Brinkley, p.35.
44. Baldwin Maxwell, 'The Alternate Titles, Dramatic Personae and lists of Actors appearing in the second folio', in *Studies in Beaumont, Fletcher and Massinger* (Chapel Hill, 1939), pp.1-13.
45. For an account of this play see *The Plays and Poems of Philip Massinger*, edited by Philip Edwards and Colin Gibson (Oxford, 1976), I, 1-98; V, 96-103.
46. The references to *Philaster* cited earlier, and the Prologue to Q 1641 of *Bussy D'Ambois* are but two examples.
47. Brinkley, pp.43-44, p.153; *Eliz. Stage*, II, 218; MSC 1, Part 3, p.281.



48. Larkin was commenting on the appointment of Nathan's brother Theophilus to be Bishop of Llandaff. Birch, II, 167; Brinkley, Note 28, p.8.
49. E.J.L.Scott, *Athenaeum* (1882), 1, p.103; *Eliz. Stage*, II, 317; Brinkley, p.42.
50. 'Taylors Wit and Mirth' in William Hazlitt, *Shakespeare Jest-Books*, 3 vols (London, 1864), III, 24-25.
51. The passage from *Wit's Triumvirate* cited in the introduction suggests that Field was at least as well known as Alleyn and Burbage. See also Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher, *Philaster; or, Love lies a Bleeding*, edited by Andrew Gurr, *The Revels Plays* (London, 1969), pp.lxxi-lxxii; *Wit's Triumvirate; or, The Philosopher*, edited by Cathryn Anne Nelson, *Salzburg Studies in English Literature*, 57 (Salzburg, 1975), IV.4.594-600.
52. Nathaniel Field was buried on 20 February 1632/3 and letters of administration were granted to his wife, on 26 March 1632/3. Brinkley, p.15 and p.153.
53. For a brief account of Field's family see Brinkley, pp.1-3. Theophilus Field was clearly a man of some distinction. He attended the Hampton Court Conference 1603-4. In a debate for the King and Queen's entertainment in Oxford in 1605 one of the opponents was 'Dr Field'. Nichols, I, 311, 315 and 533.
54. John Fletcher, *The Faithful Sheph<sup>h</sup>ardesse* (London, [1609] (?)). Also in Bowers, III, 483-612 (pp. 489-90).
55. *The Works of Ben Jonson*, edited by C.H.Herford, Percy and Evelyn Simpson, 11 vols (Oxford, 1925-1952), I, 137, hereafter Herford and Simpson.
56. The verses for *Volpone*, 'To the worthiest Maister Ionson', and for *Catiline*, 'To his worthy beloved Friend Mr. Ben Ionson', are reprinted in Herford and Simpson, XI, 322-23 and 326.
57. *Weathercock*, Q 1612, sig. [A4].
58. Tricomi identifies the person referred to in the letter as Nathan Field, but I have reservations about this since Nathan would have been only sixteen in 1603-4, the date given by Tricomi. The content of the letter suggests that 'Mr Field' and 'Dr Lodge' will be able to offer practical help and advice to friends in trouble. Perhaps 'Mr Field' is Nathan's brother Theophilus, though, of course, the 'Mr' is an inappropriate appellation for him. For a full transcript and discussion see Albert H.Tricomi, 'Two letters concerning George Chapman', *MLR*, 75 (1980), 241-48. The letter



- is transcribed by A.R.Braunmuller in *A Seventeenth-Century Letter-Book: A Facsimile edition of Folger MS. Va 321...*, edited by A.R.Braunmuller (Newark, 1983), p.129.
59. This information is derived from actor lists, the first folio list and information given in a copy of the Ben Jonson folio of 1616. James A.Riddell, 'Some actors in Ben Jonson's Plays', *Shakespeare Studies*, 5 (1969), 285-298.
  60. 'Feild the Players Letter to Mr. Sutton, Preacher att St. Mary Overs., 1616', *MS. State Papers, Domestic James 1.*, lxxxix, 105 has been printed by J.Halliwell Phillips as item 23 in *Illustrations*, Transactions of the New Shakspeare Society (1865), pp.115-117; Brinkley, p.40.
  61. *Eliz. Stage*, II, 317; Peery, p.22; Brinkley, p.42.
  62. Ashmolean, MS. 47 f49, discussed in *Aurelian Townshend's Poems and Masks*, edited by E.K.Chambers (Oxford, 1912), p.107. Lady May, was Judith, daughter of Sir William Poley of Boxted in Suffolk who at the age of seventeen married Sir Humphrey May, a widower. Field is not the only young man to be associated with Lady May. Aurelian Townshend, an impecunious minor poet, addressed a poem 'Your smiles are not as other womens bee' to her. *The Poems and Masques of Aurelian Townshend*, edited by Cedric C.Browne (Reading, 1983).
  63. For a discussion of the Jonsonian roles see Riddell, pp.293-294. *The Wit's Triumvirate* reference cited earlier implies that Field was famous for performing Philaster.
  64. George Chapman, *Bussy D'Ambois* (London, 1641), Wing<sup>C.</sup><sub>A</sub> 1941.
  65. Internal allusions make this likely. I discuss this later in the chapter.
  66. Herford and Simpson, IV, 184, 325; *Epicoene; or, the Silent Woman*, edited by R.V.Holdsworth, New Mermaids (London, 1979), p.165; Beaumont and Fletcher, F 1679; Shakespeare, F 1623.
  67. Francis Beaumont, *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*, edited by Sheldon Zitner, *The Revels Plays* (Manchester, 1984), p.66.
  68. Shakespeare and Burbage were paid for devising impresa, shield and motto for the Earl of Rutland for the anniversary of the accession of James I, 'though it seemed to have no theatrical connections at all'. Bentley, *Profession of Player*, p.63.
  69. Field is referred to in the puppet sequence. He was court payee. MSC 6, p.60.



70. 'A quaint old playhouse trick', *Stage*, 28 September 1933, reprinted in his *Speeding up Shakespeare: Studies of the Bygone Theatre and Drama* (London, 1937), pp.89-98.
71. *The Dutch Courtesan* was played at court, for example, 25 February 1612/13 and 12 December 1613 by the Lady Elizabeth's Company. MSC 13, p.55, p.62. *Eastward Ho* was presented for the King on 25 January 1613/14. MSC 13, p.62; MSC 6, p.58. *Cupid's Revenge* was played twice in the 1612/13 season, once for the King and once for the Prince and Lady Elizabeth; MSC 13, pp.55-56.
72. E.K.Chambers, *William Shakespeare*, 2 vols (Oxford, 1930) II, 391.
73. Novall Junior is the part most similar to the 'upstart' Bussy but Charalois is also impressive. If Field played Charalois then it would add an extra dimension to his lines, in a scene written by Field, 'peace, O peace, this sceane is wholly mine' (*Fatal Dowry*, II.i.73).
74. George Chapman, *Bussy D'Ambois*, edited by Nicholas Brooke, *The Revels Plays* (London, 1964, reprinted Manchester 1979), p.liv and Appendix A, p.147.
75. Robert Meriweather Wren, 'The Blackfriars Theatre and its Repertory, 1600-1608' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Princeton University, 1965), p.40.
76. John Freehafer, 'The Contention for *Bussy D'Ambois*, 1622-1641', *Theatre Notebook*, 23 (1968/9), 61-69.
77. Thomas Kyd, *The Spanish Tragedy*, Q3 1615; STC 15091.
78. Q 1618, STC 15092; Q 1623, STC 15093; Q 1633, STC 15094.
79. STC 23012.
80. Dr James Fowler of the Theatre Museum expresses similar views in a private letter to me on the subject, 17 September, 1984.
81. Richard Dutton, *William Shakespeare: A Literary Life* (London, 1989), p.52 and Note 2, p.166.



## PART TWO: What? Establishing Field's Canon

## **CHAPTER 2: 'Competent Witnesses': Methods and Techniques**



(i)

The purpose of this section is to establish in so far as it is possible to do so, what Nathan Field actually wrote. As I indicated in my introduction Field has been seriously underrated in terms of the quantity and range of his work. Establishing Field's canon more confidently may lead to recognition of Field's significant status as a playwright.

Collaborations formed an important part of Field's professional life. In this as in so much else Nathan Field is a typical man of the early seventeenth century theatre. Bentley's cautious estimate is

that as many as half of the plays by professional dramatists in the period incorporated the writing at some date of more than one man...<sup>1</sup>

Any study of Field must include some reference to his work as a collaborative playwright and reviser.

I have also been guided by a necessary pragmatism. It is clearly impossible to discuss the quality of a body of work without first establishing what it is. Establishing the canon is an essential prerequisite of my assessment of Field as a theatre playwright. By setting down defining criteria by which Field's work may be recognised, and by proposing a significant body of material for discussion this section lays the foundation for later investigations.

In order to establish Field's canon, it is necessary to enter the dangerous and unfashionable quagmire of collaboration studies and to turn to the methods of the 'disintegrators' so denigrated by Chambers and Schoenbaum.<sup>2</sup> The parlous state that Field attributions are in as a result of their efforts can be seen in my introduction. There are four main reasons why collaboration

studies are in disrepute. There was first the over-reliant and exclusive use of internal evidence: the uncritical use of metrical tests by Fleay and Boyle for example; or the excessive zeal of Sykes and Oliphant in finding literary parallels.<sup>3</sup> Secondly, early investigators were often bibliographically insecure. Thirdly, the problem is cumulative: the more successive scholars differ in their detailed and complex divisions and attributions within the same work, the less faith there can be in their individual analyses. The fourth, and perhaps the most damaging reason is the partisan nature of most of the scholarship. Almost inevitably, scholars wish to claim for their favoured author any 'good' passages and, proceeding negatively, to assign 'weaker' sections to 'lesser' authors. Their predispositions to find evidence of work with which they are most familiar is also difficult to guard against. So, in wishing to concern myself with the discrimination and attribution of authorial shares in collaborative plays, I meet with little encouragement. In 1966, Samuel Schoenbaum, reviewing the history of collaborative scholarship, came to the uncompromising conclusion that most writers on this subject have based circular arguments on weak assumptions, a judgment confirmed ten years later by Norman Rabkin who, in advocating literary criticism of collaborative plays, suggested that 'the field we are proposing to open up for study must inevitably self destruct.'<sup>4</sup> I do not wish to understate the difficulty of my enterprise. By its very nature any play is a collaborative venture. To disentangle actor interpolations, book keeper's additions, cuts and revisions and so on from the original playwright's work, for example, is always a problem in Elizabethan and Jacobean texts, even in those of a single known author.<sup>5</sup> The situation is even more complicated where the work is a collaboration and the authors are unknown. A further fundamental reason for the difficulty of assigning collaborative shares lies in the concept of playwriting itself. A Jacobean playwright contributing to a piece was, for the most part, less interested in cultivating his literary reputation than in



providing satisfying but ephemeral material as quickly as possible to please players and spectators.<sup>6</sup> Thus the authors of the 'Beaumont and Fletcher' plays were not primarily or exclusively interested in expressing personal views or in articulating individual ideas in readily identifiable styles. Norman Rabkin, making a similar point but in a different context refers to

a template for a standardized artefact, enabling a Massinger to make today's Beaumont and Fletcher play as if by cloning from the scraps of yesterday's.<sup>7</sup>

Rabkin's formulation lies at the heart of the scholarly problem. It did not matter who wrote what. If, as Rabkin points out, the real achievement of the 'Beaumont and Fletcher' plays is

the creation of a characteristic dramatic style that triumphed in the theatre and kept its pre-eminence for an appalling number of years after the playwrights had died...and that was capable of creating authentic Beaumont and Fletcher plays in which only one or neither of them had any part....

(Rabkin, p.10)

then difficulties of discrimination must, almost by definition, be built into the very fabric of the plays. When one author revises the work of his partner or partners, possibly years later, the separation of their individual shares becomes even more hazardous and conjectural.

Even apparently solid external evidence cannot always be trusted, as Schoenbaum has convincingly demonstrated.<sup>8</sup> Internal evidence is also fallible, as the work of the 'disintegrators' has shown. Versification tests, counts of run on lines or mid-line pauses, metrical variations have been extensively used but are not, I think, ultimately useful. Clifford Leech's comments on the metrical tests applied to the plays of Beaumont and Fletcher

are illuminating here:

There is common agreement that while Fletcher loves the feminine ending, the end-stopped line and the free use of extra metrical syllables within the line Beaumont is much more given to enjambement, uses the feminine ending less frequently and keeps more closely to an established metrical pattern. Yet it should be emphasised that the only dramatic entertainment published wholly as Beaumont's was *The Masque of the Inner Temple and Grays Inn* of 1613, and that *The Faithful Shepherdess* which we have every external reason to take as wholly Fletcher's is notably at odds with the accepted notion of Fletcher's versification being indeed closer to the accepted notion of Beaumont's.<sup>9</sup>

Since in the work of a skilled playwright metrical characteristics inevitably vary according to character, situation or genre I have been very cautious about the use of such tests. Metrical analysis is not a tool I have used.

I have relied much more heavily on verbal and phrasal parallels, despite some reservations. These were used indiscriminately by earlier scholars and have been one of the main reasons that collaborative studies like those of Oliphant and Sykes have been heavily criticised. Too often supposition was founded on hypothesis, and arguments for author identification were based on parallels between two unattributed plays. Entire cases were founded on parallels that could self evidently be explained by coincidence, commonplace expressions or plagiarism. Kenneth Muir, though himself the author of an important book on collaboration in which such tests are employed, expresses the view of those opposed to them:

It is impossible to prove authorship by means of parallels. Many dramatists including Fletcher and Massinger are imitative; and they tend to echo their own previous work as well as that of other dramatists.

(Muir, p.103)



Yet I cannot dismiss verbal parallels so easily. Muir's reference to the way dramatists 'tend to echo their own previous work' must be seen as a positive in this context. It is on precisely these echoes that tests are built. But the echoes need to be loud. More is needed than the repetition of a single word - though even here idiosyncratic preferences may be revealing. When the phrasal parallels result from similarity of thought or characterisation they are surely of relevance. Again, as with all the other tests, it is the quality of the units of comparison that matter.

By the laws of probability the mere accumulation of parallels - depending on what F.L.Lucas has called 'the safety of the numbers of parallels used' - cannot be mathematically defended.<sup>10</sup> Yet a series of such coincidences must contribute to a sense of a characteristic style. I have therefore used parallels in this study as indicators of Field's style.

For stylistic arguments to have any validity, of course, the plays being compared must be written in individual styles. Sykes compromised a potentially valuable essay on Field's contribution to the 'Beaumont and Fletcher' canon when he started with the inaccurate statement that 'Field is not a writer whose work can be easily recognised' (Sykes, p.200). The situation was not improved by his admission that Beaumont had been credited with work by Field because of the similarity of their styles. More is needed to define a style than metrical tests and verbal parallels. A comparative study of imagery is useful and proves to be one of the most reliable of attribution tests.

R.W.Chambers' classic demonstration of Shakespeare's hand in *Sir Thomas More* shows the greater reliability of this image cluster method, developed on the basis of work by Whiter, Armstrong and Spurgeon. This has been recently extended by Stagg's provision of reference material in his study of the imagery in Jacobean tragedies.<sup>11</sup> Brinkley has studied Field's



imagery in detail. Their work has been useful in what follows.

Orthography can be used to determine authorship.<sup>12</sup> This is one of the most hazardous of tests since it is the feature of an author's work most subject to scribal and/or compositorial interference. But unusual spellings in an otherwise orthodox text may possibly be considered authorial. Dover Wilson's earlier work on the *Sir Thomas More* manuscript or Charles Forker's more recent analyses amply exemplify this.<sup>13</sup> Unfortunately there are few cases where spellings can be said to be uniquely characteristic. The 'unusual' Shakespearian spellings detected by Forker, for example - the forms with an intrusive 'c' - are also found in the hand of Field. But orthography is useful in indicating divergent practices within a single text. It can never be entirely reliable even in distinguishing one part of a collaborative work from another since the orthographic characteristics of one writer may well overlay those of his partner or partners if he is responsible for producing the final draft of their foul papers. From his letters and from the attributed plays I have identified certain orthographic features which seem to belong to Field but have not treated them as anything more than supportive indications of his presence.

Where a play exists in manuscript there are paleographic tests to try. Unfortunately samples of an author's holograph are often not long enough to provide sufficient material for comparison, though it must be admitted that the identification of hand D in the *Sir Thomas More* manuscript as Shakespeare's was made on the basis of six signatures and two words.<sup>14</sup> And many extant manuscripts are demonstrably scribal and not authorial. This is the case with two of the plays I am primarily concerned with, *The Faithful Friends* and *The Honest Man's Fortune*. Orthography and paleography, then, are ancillary rather than major tools whose usefulness Pollard, Dover-Wilson and M.St Clare Byrne have discussed and demonstrated.<sup>15</sup> I have not



relied on them to any great extent in my attempts to establish Field's canon.

To metrical tests, verbal and stylistic parallels, orthography and paleography one must add linguistic tests. These are by far the most reliable, particularly since the work of Cyrus Hoy has been supplemented by David Lake and <sup>a</sup>McDonald Jackson.<sup>16</sup> There is now a considerable body of information available about the linguistic habits of a full range of Elizabethan and Jacobean authors.

The usefulness of Hoy's work to studies of the 'Beaumont and Fletcher' canon cannot be over-estimated. His purpose was, first, to isolate from Fletcher's unaided plays certain linguistic patterns and, second, to show how these could be used to distinguish the work of Fletcher from that of Massinger whose unaided work was linguistically distinct. Hoy counts familiar pronominal, verbal and contracted forms such as *ye, hath, doth, 'em, i'th* in the work of his selected authors. He uses as the basis for his attributions those of Fleay and Oliphant and extends his study to include the writings of Beaumont, Field and Shirley among others. Hoy's method is not new; it is built on the studies of Farnham, Thorndike, McKerrow, Greg and Partridge.<sup>17</sup> What is new is its extent and comprehensiveness. No-one since Oliphant has dealt with all of the fifty-two or so plays involved. Hoy is very well aware of the theoretical limits of his own work and makes no great claims for it:

No linguistic form can be regarded as distinctive of a particular dramatist in any absolute sense: the extent to which he employs a given form may distinguish sharply enough his practice from that of two other dramatists, but not necessarily from that of a third....

(Hoy, I, p.134)

His is a technique of establishing practical differences.

The value to be attached to any piece of linguistic criteria is, in the end, completely relative: all depends upon the degree of divergence between the linguistic patterns that are to be distinguished.

(Hoy, I, p.134)

Hoy is always careful to avoid that pitfall of earlier scholars, generalisation. He deals only with specific cases in specific contexts. Thus he emphasises that *hath* will not distinguish Field from Massinger since both use it, but may serve to distinguish both from Fletcher who does not. The absence of *ye* will not distinguish Massinger from Beaumont since neither use it, but will help to distinguish them both from Fletcher and Field who do. Hoy thus avoids the danger of single instances. His method is combinative: where demonstrable preference for certain colloquial and contracted forms is added to other instances of individual usage a linguistic pattern can be identified.

Where Hoy's bases for comparison are inadequate, or where he applies them to dramatists whose linguistic preferences are not so distinctive as those of Fletcher and Massinger, his results are less well defined. He is fallible where he confirms previous attributions on the evidence of very few linguistic forms, as, for example, in his work on *The Bloody Brother*. He is not always convincing where Beaumont is concerned, because the playwright is, to use Andrew Gurr's phrase, 'linguistically shadowy.'<sup>18</sup> As Hoy himself points out

Beaumont's linguistic practices are themselves so widely divergent as to make it all but impossible to predict what they will be from one play to another.

(Hoy, III, p.86)



Thus he is forced to proceed negatively in assigning work to Beaumont in his supposed collaborations with Fletcher. What remains after Fletcher's share has been determined must be Beaumont's. And, of course, playwrights are not always consistent. Their linguistic practice may vary according to genre and subject matter as Fletcher's does with *The Faithful Shepherdess*. It is a qualified criticism of his method that Hoy has to omit this play from his study for this reason. Playwrights' habits may change over a period of time. Hoy's linguistic analysis is perhaps more successful at isolating divergence than in attribution. Yet as long as the relative, pragmatic nature of his method is kept in mind, it can be extremely useful even here.

Hoy's linguistic data has more recently been supplemented by D.J.Lake and MacDonald Jackson in their studies of Middleton's canon. Lake acknowledging a heavy debt to Hoy, tabulated 'the essential data relevant to a particular authorship problem' (Lake, p.244). He analyzed the linguistic features of a corpus of plays, isolating exclamations, oaths, pronouns, pronoun and verb contractions, other contractions and speech prefixes. The tables of his Appendix cover all the major writers of the period except Shakespeare, who is treated more fully elsewhere. Since his corpus includes 'all the major dramatists writing during Middleton's career except Shirley and Davenant' (Lake, p.18), his tables present an invaluable body of reference material for comparison. It is possible by using Lake's tables and Hoy's analyses to create linguistic profiles of the authors relevant to this section of the thesis. These profiles can be sketched in even more clearly as a result of a recent series of articles, also by D.J.Lake on Marston's canon.<sup>19</sup> Again, an important body of material is made available for comparison. To this must be added the reference information collected by MacDonald Jackson for his study of the Middleton canon. His tables give, among other data, 'selected contractions and parentheses in Middleton and non-Middleton plays' and include invaluable lists of oaths and expletives in the work of many



dramatists of the period (Jackson, pp.185-88 and pp.191-201). It should be noted that Lake and Jackson, working independently, reach virtually identical conclusions about Middleton's involvement in every disputed and collaborative play. Each checks the other. But I am not concerned with their area of investigation: merely with the reference material that supports it. Forty three of Jackson's comparative group of plays were not used by Lake so the body of material used for comparison to identify distinctive Middleton features is very comprehensive. Jackson includes more plays by Heywood, Massinger, Shakespeare and Chapman than Lake, and includes work by Shirley, Alexander and Greville omitted by Lake. Lake's corpus also includes plays not checked by Jackson. Both, however read every play of the period. I have found the tables of Lake, Jackson and Hoy particularly useful since they have enabled me to compare characteristics I have identified as Field's in his unaided and undoubted work with those of a wide range of plays by other dramatists of the period. This, in turn, has allowed me to establish relative linguistic 'touchstones' which serve to distinguish Field's work from that of others which I can apply to disputed plays. At the same time I have been able to establish the *absence* of these features from the work of other relevant dramatists, an important factor in attribution studies. My analysis is thus built on contrastive features. I have used linguistic evidence to support and supplement stylistic and textual evidence.<sup>20</sup>

The testing of linguistic, stylistic and textual characteristics of disputed texts has a long history in attribution studies, producing results with varying degrees of success. To these I have added a test of my own: the comparative analysis of the plays' theatrical and dramaturgical characteristics. From Field's undisputed plays I have isolated certain theatrical characteristics which seem to me distinctive. These include the indications for grouping and stage movement, the anticipation and covering of entrances and exits,



the naming of characters, the use of ensemble speech and asides, and the way in which near silent action frequently replaces words. These are all important factors in recognising his 'signature of style' and can supplement more usual kinds of internal evidence.<sup>21</sup>

Test like these cannot be regarded as objective, but they may be reliable. I concede that intuitions, convictions, emotional responses and subjective judgments unsupported by external evidence or other objective factors can be misleading but I cannot agree with Schoenbaum that these carry no weight (Schoenbaum, p.178). After all, even the so-called 'objective' metrical tests are, as Muir points out

just an attempt to render mathematically what every competent reader will recognize instinctively.

(Muir, p.100)

Objective tests, literary analysis and the study of dramatic technique are complementary. When the appeal to a general literary and theatrical sensibility is strongly buttressed by a systematic analysis of the components that make up that style, presumptive evidence can complement instinct, and result in an informed response to, and reading of, the author's style.

There are critics, like Sherbo and Erdman, who argue for the superiority of internal evidence as against external evidence since 'internal evidence deals with essentials while external evidence deals with accidentals' (Sherbo, p.6). There are others, like Schoenbaum, who undervalue internal evidence.

External evidence may and often does provide incontestable proof; internal evidence can only support hypotheses or corroborate external evidence.

(Schoenbaum, p.150)

To both I would say that both types of evidence are equally necessary, and that, as might be expected, it depends on the context and the relative quality of each specific piece of evidence as to which is more important in a given situation. As Coleridge wrote

any work which claims to be authentic must have had witnesses and competent witnesses; this is external evidence. Or it may be its own competent witness; this is called internal evidence...<sup>22</sup>

Both internal and external evidence have been important in establishing Field's canon since both are equally necessary and mutually dependent. In trying any collaborative play, however, the final verdict of the court will depend as much on the humanity of the judges as on the nature and reliability of Coleridge's 'competent witnesses'.

Before proceeding to a review of the external and internal evidence on which my list of Field's plays and shares of plays is based, I must make one further statement. My sole interest is in the work of Nathan Field. Unlike my predecessors, I am not concerned with identifying the work of other authors, or assigning shares in anonymous or falsely attributed plays of the period, unless the work, at least in part, can be attributed to Field. I am concerned, for example, with the work of Fletcher, Beaumont, Massinger, Jonson and Chapman only in so far as their involvement directly affects the possibility of Field's authorship, and where the distinctive features of their work allow Field's contrastive characteristics to be recognized. This is not a study of Elizabethan and Jacobean dramatic authorship in general.



The central texts for this study are, of course, the independent plays, *A Woman is a Weathercock* (1609-11) and *Amends for Ladies* of about 1611.<sup>23</sup> Fortunately these present no problems of attribution. Each was published during Field's lifetime in an authoritative quarto with Field's name on the title page. The preliminary matter is Field's. Everything about the plays' provenance and stage history confirms attribution to Field. Our bases for comparison are sound. Field's collaboration with Philip Massinger, *The Fatal Dowry* is only marginally less secure, though it was not published until after Field's death, and the names on the title page of the quarto are reduced to initials. With *The Fatal Dowry* the problem is not one of determining authorship *per se* but of assigning respective shares. That the Field canon should not be limited to these three plays is indicated by strong documentary evidence.

The first collaborative play known to have included work by Field was written for Henslowe when they were both associated in running the Lady Elizabeth's Company. We know this from the substantial external evidence reviewed in Part One. The most useful is the famous 'tripartite letter':

you know there is xl. more at least to be receaved of you, for the play, wee desire you to lend us vl. of that, which shall be allowed to you without which wee cannot be bayled, nor I play any more till this be dispatch'd, it will looze you xxi. ere the end of the next weeke, beside the hinderance of the next new play, pray Sir Consider our Cases with humanitie...<sup>24</sup>

'Nat: Field's' letter to Henslowe is undated, but fits neatly into a sequence of letters to Henslowe which Greg dates July 1613. There are two postscripts, one by Daborne and one by Massinger. That of Daborne has given rise to

much conjecture since it reads

The mony shall be abated out of the mony remayns for the play  
of mr ffletcher & owrs.<sup>25</sup>

Further letters from Field and from Daborne, frustratingly reticent about the identity of specific plays, show that Field was an active collaborative playwright during his time with the Lady Elizabeth's Men.<sup>26</sup> That he continued to write in collaboration after his move to King's is suggested by the lost *The Jeweller of Amsterdam*, a collaboration between 'Iohn Flesher, Nathan: Field & Phillip Massinger', and by the title page of *The Fatal Dowry*, written in or around 1617 but not published until 1632. It reads

THE FATAL DOWRY: / A / TRAGEDY /  
As it hath beene often Acted at the Pri-uate House in  
Blackefryers, by his Maiesties Seruants / Written by P.M: and  
N.F....<sup>27</sup>

It is difficult to justify past assumptions that Field's name on the actor lists of *The Mad Lover*, *The Loyal Subject*, *The Queen of Corinth* and *The Knight of Malta* necessarily indicated part authorship but his presence in the company makes it not impossible.<sup>28</sup>

More relevant in defining the range of Field's work is the commendatory poem by George Chapman prefaced to the 1612 quarto of *A Woman is a Weathercock*. This begins

To many formes, as well as many waies  
Thy Active Muse, turnes like thy Acted woman:

Chapman surely implies here that Field has written in more than one genre. His verses for *Volpone*, *The Faithful Shepherdess* and *Cataline* and his



extant comedies do not account sufficiently for the 'many formes' and the 'Active Muse' to which Chapman refers (*Weathercock*: [A4r]). It seems possible then, that Field experimented with other kinds of writing between 1609-11 when he began writing plays and 1612 when *A Woman is a Weathercock* was published.

The external evidence establishes Field as a collaborative writer working with Fletcher, Massinger and Daborne, and suggests that he wrote more than has been usually attributed to him.

I turn next to the 'Beaumont and Fletcher' folio of 1647 published by Humphrey Moseley thirty one years after the death of Beaumont, twenty two years after the death of Fletcher and twenty seven years after the death of Field. Containing thirty four plays and a masque it purported to include all their plays which had not been printed before, with the exception of *The Wild Goose Chase* of which Moseley had been unable to find a copy.<sup>29</sup> This play, with seventeen others which had already appeared in quarto, was added for the second folio of 1679 which professed to include

...all both Tragedies and Comedies that were ever writ by our Authors, a pair of the greatest Wits and most ingenious Poets of their age.<sup>30</sup>

There is no indication from the publisher of the folios that any dramatist other than Beaumont and Fletcher wrote any part of the plays that appeared in their volumes.

Two verses by Aston Cokayne written in response to the 1647 volume raise the first doubts about the authorship of these plays.

Had Beaumont liv'd when this Edition came  
Forth, and beheld his euer-living name  
Before plays he never writ, how he  
Had frown'd and blush'd at such impiety

.....

And my good friend Old Philip Massinger  
With Fletcher writ in some we see there  
..... for what a foul  
And unexcusable fault it is (that whole  
Volumes of Plays being almost every one  
After the death of Beaumont writ) that none  
Would certifie them so much. I wish as free  
Y'had told the Printers this, as you did me.

Cokayne chastised the printer.

In the large book of Playes you late did print  
In Beaumont and in Fletcher's name why in't  
Did you not justice ? give to each his due?  
For Beaumont (in those many) writ a few  
And Massinger in other few.<sup>31</sup>

Not until F.G.Fleay read a paper before the New Shakspeare Society in 1874 was any real attempt made to investigate Cokayne's claim that Massinger was a major but unacknowledged contributor to the 1647 volume.<sup>32</sup> He endeavoured by the application of metrical tests to separate the work of Beaumont from that of Fletcher. In addition he identified the shares of Massinger and suggested the names of other possible contributors to the folio's plays. Among these was the name of Nathan Field. Since Fleay and Boyle the presence of other authors in the 'Beaumont and Fletcher' volumes of 1647 and 1679 has been demonstrated with greater or lesser success by the 'disintegrators' who are the focus of Schoenbaum's criticisms. Field is one such, though as Appleton reminds us, he has remained 'in the shadows'.<sup>33</sup> To confine my search for Field's work to the 'Beaumont and Fletcher' canon, and to those plays suggested by the disintegrators, would have been to set arbitrary limits. Yet my area of study needed definition. An explanation of the criteria by which plays have been selected for inclusion in this study follows.



I have examined all the extant plays listed by Harbage and Schoenbaum, and by Harbage, Schoenbaum and Wagonheim, as written for the London professional theatre between 1609/11 when Field started writing plays and 1619/20 when he died.<sup>34</sup> Of these I reserved for study two groups: all collaborations of doubtful or unknown authorship, and all plays associated with the names of Field himself, or with Fletcher, Massinger and Daborne, Field's known collaborators prior to 1619/20. These plays are listed in Appendix II. Since there is absolutely no evidence to suggest that Field was a jobbing playwright hawking his work around, I have paid close attention to the plays known to have been in the repertories of the companies for which Field worked as leading actor and/or manager, and in whose success he may be deemed to have had a financial interest: the Children of the Chapel/Queen's Revels 1609-1612/13; the Lady Elizabeth's Men, 1612/13-1616; Prince Charles' Men 1615-16; and the King's Men, 1616-1619/20. The stage history of a small subset of plays from the repertories of these companies is of interest in this context: their movement from company to company is coincident with Field's. The plays concerned are *Bussy D'Ambois*, *The Honest Man's Fortune*, *Monsieur Thomas*, *Epicoene* and *The Coxcomb*.<sup>35</sup> Of this group, those plays which cannot be definitely attributed to a single known author have been studied.

Of this list of sixty plays twenty-two can be summarily dismissed. There is no external or internal evidence to connect either of Robert Daborne's extant plays. *A Christian Turned Turk* (Kings? Queens? 1610) or *The Poor Man's Comfort* (Queen Anne's, 1617) with the collaborations alluded to in the Henslowe correspondence. *The Faithful Shepherdess* (Queens Revels, 1608) is definitely by Fletcher alone. ~~A~~<sup>The</sup> *Woman's Prize* (unknown, 1611; King's, 1633), *Bonduca* (King's, 1613), *Valentinian* (King's,

1614), *The Chances* and *The Mad Lover* (King's, 1617), *The Loyal Subject* (King's, 1618), *The Humorous Lieutenant* (King's, 1619), *Women Pleased* (King's, 1620), *The Island Princess*, *The Pilgrim* and *The Wild Goose Chase* (King's, 1621) are not collaborations. They can all be reliably attributed to Fletcher's sole authorship. Though the stage history of *Monsieur Thomas* (Lady Elizabeth's, 1615) suggests connections with Field, the linguistic evidence supports its quarto title page attribution to Fletcher alone.<sup>36</sup> I have found no evidence of sufficient strength to overturn other conventional attributions: of *Philaster* (King's, 1609), *The Maid's Tragedy* (King's, 1610), *A King and No King* (King's, 1611), *The Captain* (King's, 1612), *The Scornful Lady* (Queen's Revels?, 1613) to Beaumont and Fletcher and *Henry VIII* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen* (King's, 1613) to Fletcher and Shakespeare.<sup>37</sup>

A further four plays can also be eliminated since late revision prevents the possibility of isolating a significant quantity of Fieldian material even if his initial involvement could be assumed. In this I differ from Bertha Hensman.<sup>38</sup> Her complex hypotheses assign Field a hand in a considerable number of collaborations and revisions since she adopts the theory that many of the 'Beaumont and Fletcher' plays are Massinger revisions of originals by Fletcher and Field. As a result of her analysis of the sources of twelve plays she finds, firstly that a number of the problem plays

which as supposed collaborations, have perplexed scholars, are in fact plays which were lost from the repertory of the King's Company because they were either revised or incompletely refurbished by Massinger during the fourteen years following Fletcher's death.

(Hensman, *Shares*, p.378)

Her second and, in the context of this study, more important, claim is for



an enhanced view of the importance of Nathan Field as a contributor to post-Shakespearean drama, through his collaboration with Fletcher following the retirement and death of Beaumont. This view has been hitherto obscured by the fact that at least four of his collaborations, namely in *Rollo, Duke of Normandy*, *The Perfect Strategem*, *The Fatal Dowry* [sic] and *The Prince of Tarent* were permanently lost from the repertory of the King's company because they lay fragmented and buried beneath the later materials with which Massinger, in his work as reviser enclosed and encrusted them.

(Hensman, *Shares*, p.378)<sup>39</sup>

So Hensman asserts that 'Field was author or part-author of eleven plays altogether before his death in 1619' (Hensman, *Shares*, p.379). In this Hensman neglects her own findings since in the appendix to which she refers the reader, she actually shows him as author, part-author or reviser of at least fourteen plays. The details of Hensman's arguments will be considered when I come to my discussion of individual 'candidates' for Field's part-authorship. Suffice it to say at this point that Field's work, 'enclosed and encrusted' by Massinger to such an extent that it is no longer recognisable as Field's is not of interest to me. Neither is Fletcherian revision. I have therefore excluded *The Noble Gentleman* (King's, 1606; revised before 1625), *Wit without Money* (Lady Elizabeth's, 1614; probably revised, 1620); *A Very Woman; or, The Prince of Tarent* (King's, possibly 1619-22; revised 1634), and *Love's Pilgrimage* (Unknown, 1616; revised 1635).<sup>40</sup>

There is no sign of Field's involvement in a further group of six plays by Massinger in collaboration with, or revising the work of, Fletcher or Beaumont and Fletcher. The linguistic characteristics of Massinger and Fletcher can be readily identified and discriminated (Hoy, I): *Thierry and Theodoret* (King's, 1617), *The Little French Lawyer* (King's, 1619), *Sir John van Olden Barnavelt* (King's, 1619), *The Custom of the Country* (King's, 1620), *The Double Marriage* (King's, 1620) and *The False One* (King's,



1620).<sup>41</sup> A body of early opinion advocates Field's participation in *Cupid's Revenge* (Queen's Revels, 1608), despite its Q1615 title page attribution to Fletcher alone, and despite the stationer's reference to a single author. The second quarto gives its authors as 'Fran Beaumont & Io. Fletcher'.<sup>42</sup> I have found no reason to dissent from this though either Field or Beaumont is equally likely to have been Fletcher's collaborator on a play for the Children of the Whitefriars who performed the play at Court in 1612 and 1613.<sup>43</sup> It is unlikely, however, that *Cupid's Revenge* was a new play at these dates. If, as James Savage convincingly argues, the play dates from 1607, or early 1608, Beaumont is the more likely collaborator.<sup>44</sup> Field had not yet started writing plays where Beaumont was Fletcher's regular collaborator at this time. Since there is nothing in the play's dramaturgy, stage technique, tone or style that insists on Field's authorship, and since an early date weighs heavily in favour of Beaumont, it seems best to agree with Hoy and Bowers that the play is a Fletcher-Beaumont collaboration (Hoy, III, 90-91). *Wit at Several Weapons* (Unknown, 1613) can be assigned to Middleton and Rowley 'almost entirely'.<sup>45</sup> *The Second Maiden's Tragedy* (King's, 1611) can no longer be considered a collaborative play since its most recent editor's conclusions that it is 'stylistically, theatrically and linguistically of a piece'. It is almost certainly by Middleton.<sup>46</sup> Modern scholarship now attributes *The Nice Valour* (Unknown, 1616) also to Middleton, perhaps as Fletcher's reviser or collaborator.<sup>47</sup> *Hengist, King of Kent* (Unknown, 1618) is also by Middleton.<sup>48</sup> Ruled out by date, as well as the internal evidence is *Appius and Virginia* (Unknown, 1624, Beeston's Boys 1639). The two most likely dates, pre-1604 and post-1624, effectively rule out Field. Its attribution to Webster, with or without Heywood, is now generally accepted.<sup>49</sup> Nothing in the play's language, style or theatrical technique insists on questioning that opinion.



Virtually everything about *Nero* (Unknown, pre-1619?) is obscure.<sup>50</sup> Though it was not published until 1624 the play may have been in existence before this date since La Writ in *The Little French Lawyer*, performed between 1619 and 1623, quotes almost verbatim from the play, though it is possible, as Bentley argues, that these lines are a later interpolation (*Jac. and Car. Stage*, V, 1381). The most recent editor of *Nero* finds all evidence for the play's date inconclusive. A date as early as 1618-19, advocated by Blakemore Evans, would admit Field's authorship but there is nothing in the text of the play to alert one to his presence. This study, therefore, leaves *Nero* in obscurity.<sup>51</sup>

According to its 1613 quarto title page *The Insatiate Countess* (Queen's Revels, 1610) was acted at Whitefriars, the theatre used by the Children of the Queen's Revels, but Giorgio Melchiori, the play's most recent editor, shows that the extant text 'reflects the existence of successive authorial layers and is itself an intermediate "treatment" of the playscript'.<sup>52</sup> Since the play includes a significant number of borrowings from plays in the King's Revels Company, Melchiori concludes that *The Insatiate Countess* must have been performed at Whitefriars by that company before 1608-9. This means, of course, that Field could not be one of the hack writers whom Melchiori supposes may have been involved with Lewis Machin and William Barksted in their revision and completion of Marston's original play. This is amply confirmed by David J. Lake's recent linguistic analysis. For him 'the puzzles of *The Insatiate Countess* remain'.<sup>53</sup> In these circumstances no case can be made for Field's involvement.

Of other doubtful plays listed *The Costly Whore* (Red Bull Revels, King's Revels?, 1620), *Swetnam the Woman Hater* (Queen Anne's, 1618), *If it be not good the Devil is in it* (Queen Anne's, 1611), *The Two Noble Ladies and the Converted Conjuror* (Red Bull Revels, 1622) and *The Virgin Martyr* (Red Bull Revels, 1620) can be ruled out on the grounds of date or company or



both.<sup>54</sup> In addition the manuscript of *Two Noble Ladies* is thought to be in the handwriting of the author. It is not Field's hand.<sup>55</sup> *The Night Walker* (Lady Elizabeth's?, 1611?) is a Shirley revision of a Fletcher original.<sup>56</sup> *Preist the Barber* (Unknown, 1611) offers too little material on its two manuscript leaves to be of use in this study, and my examination of this text makes me confident Field was not involved in writing this brief satiric duologue. It is not in his hand.<sup>57</sup>

Of my original list of sixty plays, two groups remain for detailed consideration. First, as one would expect, are the plays to which Field's name has already been more or less confidently assigned: *A Woman is a Weathercock* and *Amends for Ladies*, definitely his, and *The Honest Man's Fortune* (Lady Elizabeth's, 1613), *Four Plays in One* (Unknown, 1613), *The Queen of Corinth* (King's, 1617), *The Knight of Malta* (King's, 1618), and *The Fatal Dowry* (King's, 1619).<sup>58</sup> The remaining plays are those of unknown or disputed authorship which belong to the relevant companies or whose provenance is unknown, and/or fall within the appropriate timespan. They are *Charlemagne* (Unknown, 1604, range 1603-1622), *The Birth of Merlin* (Unknown, 1608, also 1620, range 1597-1621), *The Coxcomb* (Queen's Revels, 1609, range 1608-10), *The Bloody Brother* (Unknown, 1617, King's?, 1639), *The Faithful Friends* (Unknown, 1620-28) and *The Beggars Bush* (King's, 1622, range c1615-1622).<sup>59</sup> Each of these plays has been subject to a range of tests. The results can be found in the chapters that follow and in the Appendices. My method of study for each play has been the same. Having established that the play's date, provenance and bibliographic history allow of Field's putative part-authorship, I analyze its linguistic, prosodic, textual and accidental, theatrical and literary characteristics in search of those which I have found to be demonstrably Field's. An account of these 'touchstones' prefaces the discussion of the plays to avoid repetition when dealing with



individual texts. Where disputed scenes contain more of these 'touchstones' than can be reasonably explained away as coincidence or commonplace, I have felt it possible to argue for Field's authorship. But, as one might expect, in several cases the evidence was insufficiently clear to allow positive conclusions.

The guiding principle of collaboration studies must be the quality of the comparative material. A prerequisite of using the printed texts as the basis for my analyses is therefore to establish their validity and status. It is important to know their authority and their relation to foul papers and/or prompt copy. Clearly one can only build a case on the foundations of authorial, not compositorial, scribal or book keeper characteristics. Difficulties of identifying the copy underlying printed texts are aggravated in Field's case by his being an experienced actor when he wrote them. The usual methods, particularly where stage directions are concerned, may not distinguish adequately the work of an author from a book keeper where the playwright in question has full working knowledge of staging conditions and is personally involved in preparing the play for performance. The stage directions in the Melbourne fragment seem to support this notion.<sup>60</sup>

The texts of both *A Woman is a Weathercock* and *Amends for Ladies* are sufficiently close to authorial copy to allow a reading of Field's 'signature of style'. Certain features of these plays can be isolated and described as distinctively Fieldian.

(iv)

The status of the 1612 quarto of *A Woman is a Weathercock* is clearer

than Peery surmises (Peery, p.63). The printed text shows some signs of deriving from copy used for the stage. There is, for example, the note *Cornets*, obviously a music cue for the *loud Musicke* which accompanies the re-entry of the wedding party (*Weathercock*, D3v; II.1.220). The duplicate entry for Captain Pouts in II.1 may also be a book keeper's note, though it, like other features of the text which Peery ascribes to the book keeper could be due to Field himself. It provides cover for the entrance and makes more precise the description of performance (*Weathercock*, D4; II.1.231). The brief marginal imperatives like *Write, Strike him, Fight* might suggest stage business recorded by the book keeper were it not for the fact that *Cadit Capt*, immediately following, is more obviously authorial. Latin is not the usual language of book keepers (*Weathercock*, F.3r, III.3.23-25; G4r, IV.2.83, 108).

For a play otherwise not at all academic, *A Woman is a Weathercock* has an unusual frequency of Latin stage directions which seems to complement rather than replace those in English.<sup>60</sup> Thus at the play's opening we read

\*  
*Enter Scudmore, as in his Chamber in a morning, halfe ready,  
reading a letter.*

Inserted between the following speech heading *Sc.* and the dialogue is the word *legit*. clarifying but not determining the action (*Weathercock*, Br, I.1.2-3). Later his speech is headed *Scud. loqui. ut raptus* (*Weathercock*, Br, I.1.26). Frequently the course of action is already clear from the dialogue and the Latin word is merely an accompanying gloss, as in Nevill's speech 'Farewell, Good-morrow.' where *Exiturus* appears in the margin (*Weathercock*, B1v; I.1.40), or when Scudmore's request to Nevill to read the letter is matched by *legit Ne. Scud. aliquando respiciens* (*Weathercock*, B2v, I.1.129). In the wedding scene we have *Intrant Templum*, and later the



progress of the fight between Strange and Pouts is marked by *Cadit Cap*: following the two imperatives in English (*Weathercock*, D3, II.1.179; G4r, IV.2.83, 101,108). Since Field provided front matter for the 1612 quarto of his play, it seems to me almost certain that these Latin directions are his and that they represent his commentary on the stage action he envisaged in performance.<sup>62</sup>

There is, in addition, clear evidence of authorial copy: the confusion over the speech headings in the Scudmore-Nevill discussion in Act IV, the non-assignment of a speech to Captain Pouts in Act 1, and the permissive stage direction that opens the final scene

*Enter 2. or 3. setting 3. or 4. Chaires & 4. or 5. Stooles.*

(*Weathercock*, Gr, Gv , I.V.1.7-47; B4v, I.2.93; H3v, V.2.1). The copy that went to the printer may have incorporated some book keeper's additions, but it was primarily based on authorial copy. It is therefore a reliable text for my purposes.

The status of the 1618 quarto for *Amends for Ladies* is similar. It is a well printed text, showing few of the errors that had to be corrected in the *A Woman is a Weathercock* text. As Peery explains

it contains no blanks, no misprints in signature, no stage directions without characters' names when the identity of the character is unclear, no unassigned speeches, no transposed letters, and only four patent misspellings.

(Peery, p.154)

There are two indications that the copy sent to the printer might have been prompt copy: the properties reminder *Pistols for Bro.* in V.2 anticipating the Brother's actions three lines later, and the opening stage direction of IV.3

(*Amends*, H3r, V.2.170; Gr). This reads

*Enter MAID like the foote-boy: SELDOME with a couple of  
SERIEANTS, PITS, DONNER*

and appears to include the names of two players, though these are otherwise unknown.<sup>63</sup>

A direction in I.1 may also be due to the book keeper, 'a prompter's reminder to himself' as Peery has it, since the entry of Subtle and his companions is duplicated (Peery, p.308). The fuller version, including obviously authorial direction for stage movement and action, reads

*Enter HUSBAND, embracing SUBTLE, the Lord FEESIMPLE,  
with young BOULD with a waiting Gentlewoman, WELL-  
TRI'D, HUSB: SUBTLE talke with WIFE*

(*Amends*, Bv, I.1.188)

Three lines earlier, necessitated by the dialogue that draws attention to their approach, is

*Enter SUBTLE, HUSBAND, FEESIMPLE, WEL-TRI'D*

(*Amends*, Bv)

As a book keeper's entry this is inefficient since it omits Bould, the focus of the next scene.

Other longer directions throughout the text are clearly authorial in their detailed instructions for stage action. There are numerous examples.

*Enter WIDDOW vndrest, a sword in her hand, and BOULD in  
his shirt, as started from bed.*

(*Amends*, Fr; IV.1.1)



*Enter INGEN looking on his sword and bending it, his brother  
like a Man*

*(Amends, Gv, IV.4.1)*

*Enter MAID like a foote-boy running, BROTHER after him,  
Maid kneeles betwixt 'em.*

*(Amends, G2v, IV.4.94)*

*Enter hastily M. Seldome with papers on his arme.*

*(Amends, B4, I.1.391)*

There are both indicative and imperative notes in the margins, in a manner similar to those in *A Woman is a Weathercock*. That the distinction is indifferent is best illustrated by the four consecutive lines which head the page of the quarto with signature F. Alongside the dialogue are the marginal notes *Strikes & they scuffle. Draw and fight, throw pots and stooles*. Three lines later comes *Breake off* (*Amends*, Fr, III.4.130). The action required by these directions exactly parallels the dialogue, suggesting that all are equally necessary, and that all are authorial. The arrangement is very similar to those for the action later in the play where a series of marginal instructions from *Pro. stabs his sister to a passe or two, passe* controls the conduct of another fight (*Amends*, G2v, IV.4.73-92). There is a further imperative *kisse her* (*Amends*, C4v, II.2.49) and, perhaps, incorporated into the text by mistake, 'See *Ingens* foote-boy' (*Amends*, Gv, IV.3.39).

As in *A Woman is a Weathercock* there are directions in Latin, the imperative *Cant.* for Lord Feesimple at the end of IV.2 and the incomplete *Manent* HUSBAND, WIFE, SUBTLE (*Amends*, Gr, IV.2.124; B4v, I.1.409) in I.1. If *Fr.* stands for *Frater* rather than *Franck*, *Fr.* thrusts the boy out might also include Latin. In either case Peery's emendation to *Bro.* seems unnecessary (*Amends*, G2v, IV.4.83).

One feature of the text should, perhaps be dismissed as a printer's error.

There is an inaccurate speech heading where *Tear.* is given three out of four consecutive speeches, the third one being really Lord Feesimple's. The layout on the quarto page, with Welltried's speech alongside, makes such an error plausible (*Amends*, E4v; III.4.120). Unfortunately, one cannot deduce anything about the nature of the copy from this error; a book keeper would never knowingly allow such a mistake - but then neither would a playwright. More indicative of authorial copy is another error in the long opening direction of the final scene.

*Enter old COUNT wrapt in furs, the Ladie HONOR, drest like a Bride, the Lord PROUD, WEL-TRI'D, BOULD, leading FEE-SIMPLE like a Ladie masqu'd, HUSBAND, WIFE, SUBTLE with a letter, WIDDOW, to them BROTHER, SELDOM, and his wife.*

(*Amends*, Hr., V.2.1)

Regardless of the direction it is the Brother, not Subtle, who has to

present you  
With this same letter written in his blood.

(*Amends*, Hr, V.2.9)

One might expect a book keeper's note of correction at this point, since it involves the handling of a property.

The balance of evidence suggests that the copy sent to the printer was authorial copy with some playhouse annotation and that it is sufficiently authoritative to form a basis for my investigations. I have, therefore, taken this text and Q1612 of *A Woman is a Weathercock*, and isolated Field's defining characteristics. These I have grouped under five broad headings: (i) linguistic, (ii) prosodic, (iii) textual and accidental, (iv) theatrical and (v) literary. These characteristics or 'touchstones' are not unique to Field. Their use is permissible because the techniques of collaborations study are



essentially relative and contrastive, not absolute. This point cannot be over-emphasised. It is not of primary significance that, for example, dramatic devices found in Field's plays recur in Webster's, or that Field and Middleton are equally prolific in their use of oaths. Each contrastive feature has to be placed in the context of the particular play under discussion and of the other putative playwrights involved. Thus, for example, the idiosyncratic Fieldian linguistic markers - forms in 'ee like *d'ee* and *t'ee* - can be applied widely since they occur only rarely in the work of other relevant authors, whereas *hath* and *doth* are only useful in a limited context. Their coincidence distinguishes Field's work from Massinger's and from Fletcher's, but not from Beaumont's. Similarly Field's use of rhyme to mark *sententiae*, summarise a point or to give a good exit is commonplace yet rhyming couplets can be useful in separating Field's work from Fletcher's and from Massinger's since neither of these authors uses rhyme at all frequently. Movement from prose to verse and back within a few lines is a characteristic that Field shares with Beaumont, but it sharply distinguishes them both from Fletcher and from Massinger. Furthermore, while few of the 'touchstones' I describe are very strong when viewed in isolation, their value increases with accumulation. The more the features of a disputed text are congruent with those of Field's unaided work, the more likely it is that he was responsible for it. Any one 'touchstone' might be found in isolation in the work of another Jacobean playwright, but its occurrence in a scene containing other characteristics identifiable as Field's must add to its persuasiveness. At least these defining criteria can be validly indicative, though it has to be admitted that we are always dealing with likelihoods, never with certainties.

## GROUP ONE: LINGUISTIC<sup>64</sup>

A notable feature of Field's linguistic pattern is his fondness for forms in -*ee* with *do*, *to*, *by* and *with*: *d'ee*, *t'ee*, *b'ee*, *w'ee* and even '*b'wee*. These forms are not found in the unaided work of Fletcher or Massinger and are infrequent in that of Beaumont. *Thou'rt* and *th'art* are regular features of Field's work. Fletcher and Beaumont both use *th'art* very sparingly. Field has a fairly steady but never frequent use of *ye* alongside *you*. In this he differs from Fletcher who demonstrates a strong preference for *ye*; and from Massinger and Beaumont who both almost invariably prefer *you*. A curious Jonsonian usage is *yo*. Forms with *y'* are common in Field. Neither Jonson nor Fletcher, for example, uses *y'are* with anything like the Fieldian frequency. *Your'e* with its misplaced apostrophe, is also common in Field's plays. Abbreviated and contracted forms are very frequent. *Ha'*, '*em*, *i'th*, *o'th* and '*s* for *his* and *us* are among his favourites. *Ha'* is frequently found in the work of Beaumont and Jonson. It is not used by Massinger and is very rare in Fletcher's work. Beaumont and Massinger both prefer *them* to '*em*. Fletcher's use of this contraction often appears as *um* and Jonson's as *hum*. Massinger's avoidance of the contracted forms *i'th* and *o'th* is his most notable linguistic feature. Jonson habitually writes *i'the* and *o'the*, forms occurring only occasionally in Field's, and almost never in Fletcher's, plays. Field is fairly likely to use *I'm* and *I'd* but, rarely, *I've*. The use of *I'd* distinguishes Field from Massinger, Fletcher and Beaumont, though not from Jonson. Jonson, unlike Field, uses *I've*. Beaumont has a very high frequency of *I'm*. Field also uses the contracted form *byth*. He seldom uses *a* for *he* though *a* sometimes replaces *on* or *of*. *A* for *he* is a useful discriminator between Field and Beaumont. *t'* for *to* is present in Field's work though not at a very high frequency. Fletcher tends to avoid it but Hoy



regards it as a Chapman marker (Hoy, VI, 62,63). Its low frequency in Field's work is not surprising since its most common function is to regularise blank verse lines through elision. Field's relaxed versification rarely demands this. He also writes a great deal of prose where this function is not relevant. Field very regularly uses *hath* and *doth* alongside *has* and *does* which he usually spells *do's* and occasionally *doe's*. Massinger prefers *hath* to *has* but avoids *doth*. The occurrence of *hath* is infrequent, and of *doth* rare, in Fletcher's plays. In his unaided plays Field always prefers *betwixt* to *between* and *whil(e)st* to *while*. Massinger almost invariably uses *between* and *while* and Beaumont also favours *between*.

In summary, then, one would expect a text by Field to include at varying frequencies some or all of the following: contractions with *ee*; *ha'*; *y'are* and *your'e*, *thou'rt* and *th'art*; *i'th*, *o'th* and/or perhaps *o'the*; *ye* and *you* occurring together; the coincidence of *hath* and *doth*; *em* alongside but exceeding *them*; *betwixt* and *whil(e)st*. Equally one should not expect the regular presence of *between*, *while* or *a* for *he*.

## GROUP TWO: PROSODIC

The most individual aspect of Field's handling of verse, prose and rhyme is its variety. Within a single scene a play can move easily from prose to blank verse and from both to rhyme within a few lines. This stylistic flexibility is always in the service of character and dramatic situation. Linguistic shifts mark stages in the plot: theatrical impact is reinforced by metrical contrasts as, for example, when Scudmore's inflated rhetoric is undercut by Nevill's prosaic tones or when Bould shifts from relaxed

conversational prose via blank verse to a triumphant closing rhyme to confirm his moment of success (*Weathercock*, I.1.154; *Amends*, III.3.123). Whereas Fletcher and Massinger are very sparing in their use of prose, Field employs it much more frequently, often where character or genre might have been expected to dictate verse (Fleay, 'On Metrical Tests', p.53; Boyle, *Trans.*, pp.584-85).

Field's blank verse is not heavily textured or syntactically complex. His sentence construction follows the continuities and shifts in his character's thought processes. Thus he is often metrically imprecise as natural speech rhythms take precedence over mechanical accuracy. His verse is very variable in quality. There are moments of simple lyric beauty (*Weathercock*, I.1.154). At other times he appears to deserve Edwards' dismissal of 'the windy pathos of their rhetoric' or Brinkley's disparaging comments on his hyperbole and bombast (Edwards, I.1; Brinkley, p.98).

Neither Massinger nor Fletcher use much rhyme (Fleay, 'On metrical Tests', p.53; Boyle, *Eng. Stud.* 5, p.87). Field uses it extensively, in both conventional and rather more idiosyncratic ways. In *Weathercock* all blank verse scenes end with a rhyming couplet. Field even adds a few lines of verse at the end of two predominantly prose scenes in order to facilitate a rhymed finish (*Weathercock*, III.1, IV.2). In *Amends* only the three scenes which end in prose do not end on a couplet, apart from IV.1 which concludes with a song. His frequent *sententiae* and proverbial expressions are almost always marked by rhyme. Extended passages of rhyme are used parodically. Rhyme is used to clinch the point of a speech, to emphasise the climax of a scene and to give a good exit. It confirms the end of a phrase mid-scene, or marks the temporary resolution of an episode.

It is often difficult with Field's work to know whether a passage should be laid out as prose or verse. Partly this is the result of the break-down in regular blank verse when lines are shared by speakers. Lines are very



unequal in length. His rhythmical prose has many of the qualities of an uneven blank verse. Concern with the natural rhythms of the speaking voice overrides regular metrical considerations.

### GROUP THREE: TEXTUAL AND ACCIDENTAL

We know from the orthography of Field's autograph letters to Henslowe that he favours spellings with an intrusive *c* such as *thincke* and *thanckful*.<sup>65</sup> When we find the forms *Franck*, *Punckes* and *winck* they may be indicative (*Amends*, Gv, IV.4.1, 7, 14; G3v, V.1.39; H2v, V.2.142).

Field's use of apostrophes seems careless. Both quartos were seen carefully through the press according to Peery, yet we still have errors like *their's* (*Weathercock*, G3r, IV.2.28), *I'ts* (*Amends*, Dv, II.2.120, E2r, III.3.11), *men't* (*Amends*, Er, III.2.47), *e'm* (*Amends*, F3v, IV.2.10), *ha's* (*Amends*, C3r, II.1.95; A4v, I.1.123; E2v, III.3.63) and *you'r* (*Amends*, Fr, IV.1.13). *t'is* is a regular form.<sup>66</sup> An odd redundant apostrophe appears in *dy'de* (*Weathercock*, Bv, I.1.37; *Amends*, G2r, IV.4.56), *ti'de* (*Weathercock*, Gr, IV.1.9), *beli'de* and *li'de* (*Weathercock*, Ir, V.2.108) to parallel *Weltri'd*, a regular form of the name in *Amends*. We also have *trid'e* (*Amends*, C1v, I.1.507). Clearly one could not build a case on such slight evidence but the placing of apostrophes in disputed texts is at least noteworthy.

Field is by no means unique in bracketting vocatives in the way that Ralph Crane, the King's Men's scribe is thought to have done.<sup>67</sup> But he has an idiosyncratic approach to their use that is much less common. In Field's plays brackets seem to serve a theatrical rather than a grammatical function, marking tones of voice rather than syntactic units. Replacing commas, they

indicate phrasing for the player. Obeying a rare direction indicating the delivery of a line Scudmore, '*loqui ut raptus*', addresses Nevill:

If (what I feele) I could expresse in words,  
Methinkes I could speake joy enough to men,  
To banish sadnesse from all love, for ever.

(*Weathercock*, Br-Bv, I.1.27)

Bould explains to Lord Feesimple

I did but trie the tendernesse of your conscience, all this is  
nothing so, but to sweeten the tale (I have for you) I foretold you  
this fain'd mischance.

(*Amends*, F4v, IV.2.104)

A similar non-syntactical use of brackets marks the Brother's challenge to the assembled company

When they have done (whats fit) you shall not neede  
To breake the door....

(*Amends*, H3r, V.2.178)

Similarly, they are used like modern dashes where important plot information is relegated to parentheses. Strange's improvised story for Captain Pouts is a case in point:

I am her Kinsman, and being newly come  
Ouer, and not intending to stay long  
Tooke this day to go see my Cozen *Worldly*  
(For so my Name is) where I found all of them  
So deeply drenched in the Bridall cup,  
That sleepe had tane possession of their eies;

....

Introth their postures and their sleepe like death,  
(For their's was liker death, then sober sleepe)  
Remembred me of body-scattered fields...

(*Weathercock*, G3r, IV.2.16, 27)



In the soliloquy that opens II.2 of the same play, Nevill explains how his disguise as a priest will help his friend:

By this means, where my friend confronts the Maide,  
At the Church doore (where I appointed him  
To meete him, like my selfe: for this strange shape  
He altogether is unwitting of)  
If she (as one Vice in that set alone  
Were a great Vertue) to inconstancy past,  
Ioyne impudency....

(*Weathercock*, Dr, II.1.7)

Often, with Field, brackets indicate phrasing, replacing commas even in very short phrases, as, for example, when Kate tells her sisters

Introth thy state is happier much then ours  
Were never two (like us) unfortunate.

(*Weathercock*, H2r, V.1.30)

Field uses brackets to indicate shifts of dramatic focus within a speech. This theatrical rather than grammatical approach to the language of the play is entirely typical of Field.

Of other textual features, the *Omnes* speech heading is a useful marker of Field's presence. Lake's table shows that there is an unusually high frequency of this speech heading in Field's plays (Lake, Band 4(9)). Idiosyncratically, Field does not use this only to represent unison speech: it also prefaces general undifferentiated contributions by onlookers that would presumably be sorted out at rehearsal. In the 1647 folio text this speech heading is consistently *All*.

As my discussion of the nature of the quarto copy of *Weathercock* and *Amends* makes clear, extensive Latin stage directions are another Fieldian

characteristic. These extend beyond the merely conventional. *Exiturus*, *Intrant Templum* and *Legit Ne. Scud. aliquando respiciens* are useful examples (*Weathercock*, B1v, I.1.40; B2v, I.1.129; D3, II.1.179).

One further feature of Field's stage directions is worthy of comment. His preferred form of words to indicate disguise is usually 'like a'. *Enter MAID like an Irish foot-boy with a dart...* (*Amends*, D1v, II.3.10), *Enter Strange like a Souldier amazedly* (*Weathercock*, F4v, III.4.16) and *Enter his Brother like a woman maskt* (*Amends*, D2v, II.3.76) are just a few of many examples. Nevill is 'like a Parson' (*Weathercock*, C4v, II.1.1), Bould 'like Princox' (*Amends*, Ev, III.3.1) and Ingen 'like a Doctor' (*Amends*, H2v, V.2.117).

#### GROUP FOUR: THEATRICAL

Field visualises stage movement from the point of view of the player in the theatre space.

##### *Exeunt*

*Scud.*

Blessed Fate.

*Scudmore passeth one doore, and entereth the other,  
where Bellafront sits in a Chaire under a Taffata  
Canopie.*

(*Weathercock*, E4v, III.2.66)

The player's moves relocalize the scene. The movements of the Husband at the resolution of *Amends for Ladies* is a further example, which Peery has obscured by shifting the position of his *Exit* by two lines (*Amends*, G4, V.1.73). There is no need to add an entry for the Husband at line 128 as Peery



does. The Husband has re-entered immediately to complete his soliloquy at line 76.

The singular pronoun in

*Enter MAID like a foote-boy running, BROTHER after him,  
Maid kneels betwixt 'em...*

(*Amends*, G2v, IV.4.94)

emphasises the way Field's texts represent visualised performance, not narrated story. Field is unusually specific in his control of stage movement. Long stage directions determine the spatial relationships of his characters on stage. There are numerous examples in his plays.

*Seldome having fetch a candle, walk's off at th'other end of the  
Shop, Lord sits by his wife.*

(*Amends*, C2v, II.1.71)

*A curtaine drawne, a bed discover'd, Ingen with his sword in  
his hand, and a Pistoll, the Ladie in a peticoate, the Parson...the  
Bro. set back to back*

(*Amends*, H3, V2, 180-184)

*Count.* Tell him al *Scudmore*, whilst I go a  
woing again. Sir *Iohn* will you go along,  
and my two worshipful Elders, I pray  
be you witnesses, Priest goe  
not you away. Hart I have so rumi-  
on a Wife, that I must haue  
one this night, or I shal run proud.  
*Mistris Lucida*, you did once love mee....

(*Nev. Scud. Bell. Stra.*  
(*Kate. Whispers in one*  
(*part. Pend. Sir Abra.*  
(*& Wag. in another.*

(*Weathercock*, I2; V2, 178-183)

Here the Count's lines give the position of most of the characters while the accompanying marginal note completes the picture. Directions are also given for actors not immediately involved in the dialogue.

*Count discoursing with In: La: Abra: looking about*

*(Weathercock, C1v; I.2, 145)*

Lengthy stage directions determine the order and conduct of the wedding procession.

*Musicke. Enter Sir Iohn Worldly, who meets the Parson, & entertaines him. Count, Bellafront, Strange, Kath. Lucida, with Willow. Pendant, Sir Inno: Ninnie, my Ladie Ninnie, Mrs. Wagtayle, S. Abram Melancholy. W.P. walk gravely afore all softly on. Scudmore stands before, and a Boy singes to the tun'd Musicke.*

*(Weathercock, D2r-D2v, II.1.116)*

Detailed instructions are given for the progress of the dance.

*...the Musicke playes, and they enter. After one straine of the Musicke, Scudmore takes Bellafront, who seemes unwilling to dance, Count takes Lucida, Pendant Kate, Sir Abraham, Mistris Wagtaile, Scudmore as they stand, the other Courting too, whispers as followes...*

*Soft Musicke*

*....*

*Musicke, & they dance, the second strain, in which Scudm: goes away with her*

*Om. Spect. Good verie good.*

*The other foure dance, another straine, honor and end.*

*(Weathercock, H3v, H4r, V.2, 8-13, 28-31)*

Field gives detailed directions for the manner of entries

*Enter Scudmore as in his Chamber in a morning, halfe ready, reading a Letter.*

*(Weathercock, A4r, I.1.1)*



or

*Enter Sir Abraham and Pendant stealing*

(Weathercock, F4v; IV.3.26)

or of exits

*Exit with Cap. on his backe*

(Weathercock, F4r, IV.2.124)

Almost all exits and entrances are anticipated and/or covered by dialogue to bridge the time it takes for an actor to cross the stage. Entrances are specified several lines before the character takes part in the action. In Peery's edition this is sometimes obscured as, for example, when he moves *Enter his Brother like a woman maskt* from before Ingen's speech to several lines later (*Amends*, D2v, II.3.76). Stage business is frequently given to cover an entrance, to indicate location, and to determine grouping.

*Enter Sir Abraham throwing downe his Bowles*

(Weathercock, F2v, III.3.1)

*Enter Pendant, and Mistris Wagtaile, with worke, sowing a purse*

(Weathercock, G4r, IV.3.1)

*Enter Sir Iohn Worldly, with two with Torches and Cudgels*

(Weathercock, H2v, V.1.48)

*Enter HUSBAND, embracing SUBTLE, the Lord FEESIMPLE with young BOULD like awaiting Gentlewoman. WELTRI'D, HUSB: SUBTLE talke with WIFE*

(*Amends*, B1v, I.1.188)

The story line is clarified when new characters are introduced. Characters are named, usually within three or four lines of entry.

*Enter hastily*

*Omnes.* Whose this? Whose this? *M.Seldome with papers*  
*Maid.* This is our Land-lord, Master *on his arme*  
Seldome,  
An exceeding wise Citizen...

(Weathercock, B4v, I.1.391)

*Enter old Sir Innocent Ninnie, my Lady Ninnie,  
Sir Abraham, and Mistris Wagtayle*

*Cou.* Heere's more Guesse.  
*Cap.* Is that Man and Wife?  
*Pen.* It is Sir *Innocent Ninnie*, that's his Lady.  
And that *M. Abraham* their onely sonne.

(Weathercock, Cr, I.2.139)

Field rarely relies on language alone to achieve his dramatic effects. Frequently action replaces words. His reticence at moments of crisis is a further distinguishing feature.

*Kate.* Oh my deere Strange. *Discovers himselfe.*  
*World.* My Sonne.  
*Scud., Luci., Bell.* Brother.  
*Om.* Yong Strange

(Weathercock, V.2.165)

Field's dramaturgy is very flexible. Scenes vary enormously in length (*Weathercock*, 21-411; *Amends*, 34-455 lines). Scene divisions are frequently disregarded. Relocalizations appear midscene (*Weathercock*, III.2). Bridges between scenes are fluid geographically and/or chronologically (*Weathercock*, V.1, V.2 and *Amends*, IV.1). Field favours an extended opening consisting of a series of expository encounters with a stationary



protagonist, rather than a short introductory conversation between two anonymous gentlemen. Within a single scene the number of characters involved in the dialogue is constantly varied by their comings and goings. Episodes involving more than three speakers are very frequent. As I have already mentioned, the number of speeches headed *Omnes* is unusually high. Solo speech even by those not alone on stage is common. Overhearing scenes and commentaries are favoured, giving many scenes a double focus, with either one or more members of one group commenting on the other as the dialogue moves between them (*Weathercock*, I.2.1; III.3, *Amends*, V.2). Often the comments are addressed directly to the audience (*Weathercock*, I.2, II.2), an extension of the use of the aside. At one point the actor playing the Count even addresses the theatre musicians directly (*Weathercock*, I.2.397).

Field's concern with the clarity of his story-telling yields a further criterion by which his work may be characterized - his habit of the swift explanatory aside to the spectators at the moment when some out of character action is performed. The Maid's surprising acceptance of her brother's marriage plans, and the hurried 'I must doe this, else had they fought againe' (*Amends*, IV.4.149) is the best example. For the same reason scenes frequently end on a soliloquy which allows the character to share the situation with the spectators.<sup>68</sup>

Music and songs are vital components of his work. There are at least eight distinct music cues in *A Woman is a Weathercock*, and the last scene resolves the plot in a masked dance (*Weathercock* C4v, I.2.393; D2r, II.1.111; D2v, II.1.122; D3v, II.1.220,222; E3v, III.2.1; H3v, V.2; I2v, V.2.234). A boy sings to 'the tun'd Musicke'. *Amends for Ladies* is less musical but again there is 'the Song sung by the Boy' and a music cue (*Amends*, F3r, IV.1.140, 157). The last scene with the triumphal crowning of Maid, Widow and Wife

calls for music but none is marked in the text.

#### GROUP FIVE: LITERARY

Roberta Brinkley has analyzed Field's figurative language in detail (pp.63-65). The range and type of classical allusions she draws attention to do not seem to me particularly noteworthy, but his fondness for rivers, uniting streams and trees and his concern for all aspects of clothing, 'cast sutes' and 'fallen bands' included, are interesting. Jewels and animals are also features of his imagery. Love is associated with dogs and graves.

Brinkley has also listed Field's 'word-usage' (pp.69-70), pointing out his use of Latinisms. He is on occasions self-consciously etymological in his vocabulary. Thus 'a dear sonne' is 'exhausted' out of his father's veins (*Weathercock*, I.1.121) and in *Amends for Ladies* 'shee and her honour are praecipitated' (*Amends*, II.3.57). In *A Woman is a Weathercock* a prayer is uttered that 'the Merchant may re-spire againe' (*Weathercock*, IV.2.71). He relishes unusual words like 'pratique' and 'morglay' (*Amends*, I.1.156; *Weathercock*, IV.3.34). He forms a comparative adverb in *-ier* as, for example, *safelyer* (*Weathercock*, IV.2.48) and *cleanlier* (*Amends*, IV.4.67). His use of Latin is frequent and conscious. This is indicated by his own ironic comments in both the Dedication and the Address prefacing *A Woman is a Weathercock* that he is capable of producing work 'without a Latine sentence' (A3).

Field uses a remarkably high number of oaths and expletives in his plays even in serious passages where decorum might otherwise be expected to minimise their use (Jackson, Tables VIII and IX; Lake, Table 1.1, 3a and 4a). My own study of these items confirms that *pish*, as earlier commentators have suggested, can be regarded as a Fieldian marker (Brinkley, p.100). Its use



is not confined to a particular character type or situation. The serious Scudmore, the unctuous Pendant and the foolish knight Sir Abraham all use it in *A Woman is a Weathercock*. It is favoured by both men and women - the Widow and Wife in *Amends for Ladies* are as ready to say *Pish* as almost any of the male characters. By contrast Beaumont, Fletcher, Chapman and Massinger virtually never use this exclamation (Jackson, Table VIII; Lake, 1.1, 3a). Oaths used with distinctive frequency by Field are *hart* and the related *s'hart*, used at least twenty times in the unaided comedies. Also very popular are *swounds*, *by this light* and *s'foote/sfoot/s'fut*. Variations are *slight* and the very unusual *vdslight*. Another unusual form in *vds-* is *vdswill*. *Gods precious* and *By Gods lid* also occur alongside the more usual *slid*. Other distinctive expressions one might expect from a Fieldian text are *s'blood*, *law or law ye*, *look ye* and *hoy day* though none of these is remarkably frequent in his unaided work. Brinkley picks out *Humh* as a typical Fieldian form and this is confirmed by Lake's count (Lake, Table 1.1, 4a). This is misleading if one is dealing with exclamations. Wagtail's sickness in *A Woman is a Weathercock* and Count Feesimple's repulsive cough in *Amends for Ladies* are represented by this group of letters and so the figures are artificially high. But, nevertheless, Field employs variants of *hum*, *humph*, *humpe*, *umh* and so on to represent a range of different non-verbal noises - so to that extent *humh* may be regarded as a Fieldian trademark. He uses *by my troth* with fair regularity, a useful distinguisher from both Fletcher and Massinger. Unlike Field, neither Massinger nor Fletcher uses many oaths or exclamations at all. Their dramatic dialogue is further from natural speech than Field's. But in assessing comparative figures for oaths and expletives it must be borne in mind that the texts of plays in the 'Beaumont and Fletcher' folio of 1647 appear to have undergone a purging of oaths. With these reservations in mind, it is possible to use the oaths and exclamations I have listed above as markers for recognising Field's

work.

There is no way in which a taste for bawdy and for sexual innuendos can be regarded as uniquely distinctive of any author. Much of the humour of the period depends on these features. Yet Field's usages are overt, almost clumsily over explicit - a crude kind of schoolboy humour that sometimes seems forced and ill judged. At others there is a great deal of fun. Field's concern with 'longtooles', 'puddings' and 'yards' is never merely disgusting - more, what T.W.Craik has described as 'a pure kind of dirt'.<sup>69</sup> There is a healthy enjoyment of appetite - not a disgust at the flesh. This is largely a matter of context and tone.

(iv)

A caveat must be made at this point. In determining shares of collaborative texts I have not been able to fix absolute divisions between playwrights or to allocate every single line. Sharp distinctions are blurred by the individual habits and normalizing tendencies of composers and scribes. The working practices of the playwrights also suggest that a single scene may contain the work of more than a single author. We know that they consulted about 'the plotte'. Field himself 'spent a greate deale of time in conference about this plott' with Daborne in planning a play for Henslowe (*Henslowe Papers*, Article 100, p.84). Daborne, anxious to meet the deadline on two new plays, also wrote to Henslowe:

I have not only labord my own play which shall be ready before they come over but give Cyrill Tounour an act of ye Arregnment of London to write yt we may have yt likewise ready for them.

(*Henslowe Papers*, Article 78, p.72)



Dekker's admission that he wrote one act *and* one speech in the last act of a 1624 Red Bull play supports the idea of allocation by acts, but introduces an important qualification. Even if allocation by acts were the basic system there is clearly no reason why an author, not otherwise responsible for an actor or scene should not, as Dekker did, add one speech, or intervene in its composition by inserting a few lines or by minor revisions and suggestions while the play was being written. Common sense and my own experience of collaborative composition both suggest that this must be the case. At the very least, the orthographic characteristics of one writer may well overlay those of his partner, or partners, if he is responsible for producing the final draft of their ~~four~~ papers. At best I can only hypothesise which playwright is primarily responsible for a scene.

With these reservations in mind, I turn in the next chapter to a discussion of *The Fatal Dowry*. Thereafter I analyze each of the disputed texts in turn. No one criterion recommends itself for the ordering of these later chapters. The ever present danger in collaboration studies is that one will build speculation upon hypothesis and that attributions will be made on the basis of comparison with hypothetically attributed material. Yet my method is essentially cumulative. A certain amount of cross referencing is both necessary and unavoidable. It may also be desirable. In the end I have opted for an approximately chronological arrangement by company, whilst acknowledging that in an area with so few points of reference any organisation may appear merely arbitrary. At least by starting with *The Fatal Dowry* I may gain a firm foothold in the 'quagmire' of collaboration study.



## NOTES

1. G.E.Bentley, *The Profession of Dramatist in Shakespeare's Time: 1590-1642* (Princeton, 1971), p.199. Hereafter Bentley, *Profession*.
2. *Eliz. Stage*, IV *passim*; S.Schoenbaum, *Internal Evidence and Elizabethan Dramatic Authorship: An Essay in Literary History and Method* (Evanston, 1966).
3. F.G.Fleay, 'On Metrical Tests as Applied to Dramatic Poetry', *Transactions of the New Shakspeare Society* (London, 1874), 51-54; F.G.Fleay, *A Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama, 1559-1642*, 2 vols (London, 1891). Hereafter Fleay, *Biog. Chron.*; R.Boyle, 'Beaumont, Fletcher and Massinger', *Transactions of the New Shakspeare Society* (London, 1880-6), 579-628; R.Boyle in a series of articles 'Beaumont, Fletcher and Massinger', *Englische Studien*, 5 (1882), 74-96; 7 (1884), 66-87; 8 (1885), 39-61; 9 (1886), 209-39; 10 (1887), 383-412; E.H.C.Oliphant, *The Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher: An Attempt to Determine their Respective Shares and the Shares of Others* (New Haven, 1927); H.D.Sykes, *Sidelights on Elizabethan Drama: A Series of Studies Dealing with the Authorship of sixteenth and seventeenth century Plays* (London, 1924).
4. Norman Rabkin, 'Problems in the Study of Collaboration', *RORD*, 19 (1976), 7-13 (p.12).
5. Scott McMillin in an article on the *Sir Thomas More* manuscript comments usefully on the 'textual debris' which 'lies behind the most coherent stage performance', 'The Book of Sir Thomas: date and acting companies', in *Shakespeare and 'Sir Thomas More': Essays on the Play and its Shakespearian Interest*, edited by T.Howard-Hill (Cambridge, 1989), pp.57-76 (p.57).
6. One notable exception is, of course, Ben Jonson. What evidence there is about working methods is conveniently summarised by Bentley, *Profession*, pp.197-210, and Neil Carson, *A Companion to Henslowe's Diary* (Cambridge, 1988), pp.58-60. L.Wann provides a critical account of earlier work by Thompson and Hatcher in his 'The Collaboration of Beaumont, Fletcher and Massinger', in *Shakespeare Studies*, University of Wisconsin Department of English (Madison, Wisconsin, 1916), pp.147-73; O.L.Hatcher, 'Fletcher's Habits of Dramatic Collaboration', *Anglia*, 33 (1910), 219-31; E.N.S.Thompson, 'Elizabethan Dramatic Collaboration', *Englische Studien*, 40 (1909), 30-35.
7. Rabkin, p.10. Rabkin's article is concerned solely with literary criticism, not attribution.



8. For a full discussion of this see Schoenbaum, pp.151-59, and Kenneth Muir, *Shakespeare as Collaborator* (London, 1960), pp.1-3, where they give many examples of fallible external evidence.
9. The anomalies Leech describes are partly the result of genres. *The John Fletcher Plays* (London, 1962), p.24. A further problem with versification tests is that they are subject to the vagaries of lineation. The metrical tables of Fleay and Boyle still serve as the basis of all work on the metrics of the 'Beaumont and Fletcher' plays, even in modern editions, and are useful as indications even if they are not entirely reliable.
10. Cited by Inga-Stina Ekeblad, 'Webster's Constructional Rhythm', *ELH*, 24 (1957), 165-76 (p.166).
11. R.W.Chambers, 'Some sequences of Thought in Shakespeare and in the 147 lines of Sir Thomas More', *MLR*, 26 (1931), 251-80; and his 'The Expression of Ideas - particularly Political Ideas - in the Three Pages and in Shakespeare', in *Shakespeare's Hand in the Play of Sir Thomas More*, edited by A.W.Pollard and others (Cambridge, 1923), pp.142-87, hereafter cited as *Shakespeare's Hand; Man's Unconquerable Mind* (London, 1939); W.Whiter, *A Specimen of Commentary on Shakespeare* (London, 1794); E.A.Armstrong, *Shakespeare's Imagination* (London, 1946); Caroline Spurgeon, 'Imagery in the Sir Thomas More fragment', *RES*, 6 (1930), 257-70; Louis C.Stagg in a series of monographs on the figurative language of Chapman, Heywood, Jonson, Marston, Middleton, Tourneur and Webster. *An Index to the Figurative Language of Ben Jonson's Tragedies* (Charlottesville, 1967); *An Index to the Figurative Language of John Webster's Tragedies* (Charlottesville, 1967); *An Index to the Figurative Language of Thomas Heywood's Tragedies* (Charlottesville, 1967); *An Index to the Figurative Language of George Chapman's Tragedies* (Charlottesville, 1970); *An Index to the Figurative Language of John Marston's Tragedies* (Charlottesville, 1970); *An Index to the Figurative Language of Thomas Middleton's Tragedies* (Charlottesville, 1970); *An Index to the Figurative Language of Cyril Tourneur's Tragedies* (Charlottesville, 1970).
12. Charles R.Forker considers the 'unusual' Shakespearian spellings of the *Sir Thomas More* manuscript. These include *banck* and *thinck*, orthographic forms he finds worthy of comment. 'Webster or Shakespeare? Style, Idiom, Vocabulary and spelling in the additions to *Sir Thomas More*', in Howard-Hill, pp.151-70 (p.165).
13. J.Dover Wilson, 'Bibliographical Links between the Three Pages and the Good Quartos', in *Shakespeare's Hand*, pp.113-141.
14. E.M.Thompson, 'The Handwriting of the Three Pages Attributed to Shakespeare compared with his signatures', in *Shakespeare's Hand*,



- pp.57-112; *Shakespeare's Handwriting* (Oxford, 1916).
15. Alfred Pollard, 'Elizabethan Spelling as a Literary and Bibliographic Clue', *The Library*, 4th series, 4 (1923-4), 1-8; M. St. Clare Byrne, 'Antony Munday's Spelling as a Literary Clue', *The Library*, 4th series, 4 (1923-4), 9-23.
  16. Cyrus Hoy in a series of articles 'The Shares of Fletcher and his Collaborators in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon, Parts I-VII, *Studies in Bibliography* 8 (1956), 129-46; 9 (1957), 143-62; 11 (1958), 85-106; 12 (1959), 91-116; 13 (1960), 77-108; 14 (1961), 45-67; 15 (1962), 71-90; David J. Lake, *The Canon of Thomas Middleton's Plays: Internal Evidence for the Major Problems of Authorship* (Cambridge, 1975); MacDonald P. Jackson, *Studies in Attribution: Middleton and Shakespeare* (Salzburg, 1979).
  17. Willard Edward Farnham, 'Colloquial Contractions in Beaumont and Fletcher, Massinger and Shakespeare as a test of Authorship', *PMLA*, 31 (1916), 326-358; A.H. Thorndike, *The Influence of Beaumont and Fletcher on Shakespeare* (New York, 1901); *The Spanish Curate*, edited by R.B. McKerrow in *The Works of Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher*, Variorum edition, 4 vols (London, 1905), II, 101-228; *The Elder Brother*, edited by W.W. Greg in *The Works of Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher*, Variorum edition, II, 1-100; A.C. Partridge, *The Problems of Henry VIII Reopened* (Cambridge, 1949).
  18. *Philaster; or, Love lies a Bleeding*, edited by Andrew Gurr, *The Revels Plays* (London, 1969), p.xx.
  19. D.J. Lake, 'Eastward Ho: Linguistic Evidence for Authorship', *Notes and Queries*, ns.28 (1981), 158-66, *The Insatiate Countess: Linguistic Evidence for Authorship*, *Notes and Queries*, ns.28 (1981), 166-70; *Histriomastix: Linguistic Evidence for Authorship*, *Notes and Queries*, ns.28 (1981), 148-52; 'Webster's Additions to *The Malcontent*, *Notes and Queries*, ns.28 (1981), 152-158.
  20. I have taken note here of T. Howard-Hill's warnings about the risks associated with 'scientific' methods. Commenting on 'the discrepancy of results of stylistic studies and critical judgment' in the assigning of shares in the *Sir Thomas More* manuscript, he reminds us that these are 'discredited when stylometrists disagree...', Howard-Hill, p.4.
  21. The phrase is David Erdman's. 'The Signature of Style', *Bulletin of New York Public Library*, 63 (1959), 88-109; Arthur Sherbo, 'The Uses and Abuses of Internal Evidence; The Case for Internal Evidence', *Bulletin of New York Public Library*, 63 (1959), 5-20.
  22. Cited by Schoenbaum, p.27. S.T. Coleridge, 'Intercepted Correspondence', *Morning Post*, 3 February 1800.



23. The date of *Weathercock* need not be 1609 as has been assumed until now. Its *terminus a quo* is late 1609, since there is an allusion to the Cleve wars and its 'cast captains' in the text. Its *terminus and quem* is the Stationer's Register entry for the quarto edition on 23 November 1611. The title page of this quarto, published in 1612, states that the play was 'performed divers times privately by the Children of Her Maiesties Revels and before the King at Whitehall'. Chambers assumes that the title page must refer to a Court performance in the Winter of 1609-10 by the Whitefriars Children. Keysar was paid for five performances that season. However, Chambers' assumption rests on his notion that there were no performances by the Children in the following season. This is not the case. The accounts of the Treasurer of the Chamber and of the Office of Works both confirm payments for a performance on February 2, 1611, and for numerous plays by the Children of the Whitefriars. A date of 1609 is, of course, still possible, but it is not certain. 1610 is equally possible and would also avoid one difficulty of nomenclature. The Children of the Whitefriars were not called Children of Her Majesties Revels until after 4 January 1610. But the title page may, of course, be using the company's title at the date of publication. In any case Rosseter's patent of 4 January merely returned them to a name they had held previously. The evidence is inconclusive. All we can say is that *A Woman is a Weathercock* was written in either 1609 or 1610. *Eliz. Stage*, II, 59; *Dramatic Records with declared Accounts of the Treasurer of the Chamber, 1558-1642*, edited by David Cook and F.P.Wilson, Malone Society Collections, 6 (1962), p.50; *Dramatic Records in the Declared Accounts of the Office of Works, 1560-1640*, edited by F.P.Wilson and R.F.Hill, Malone Society Collections, 10 (1977), pp.22-3; H.N.Hillebrand, *The Child Actors, A Chapter in Elizabethan Stage History* (Urbana, 1926), p.238; Mary Susan Steele, *Plays and Masques at Court During the Reigns of Elizabeth, James and Charles*, (New York, 1926, reissued, 1968), p.162; 'Dramatic Records from the Patent Rolls; 'Company Licences', edited by E.K.Chambers and W.W.Greg, in *Collections*, Malone Society (Oxford, 1909), 1 Part 3, pp.260-84 (pp.271-2).
24. *Henslowe Papers, being Documents Supplementary to Henslowe's Diary*, edited by W.W.Greg (London, 1907), Article 68, pp.65-66. Greg dates this letter as 'probably' early July 1613.
25. Many attempts have been made to identify this collaborative work. Chelli, for example, thinks it *The Bloody Brother*; Fleay and Chambers suggest *The Honest Man's Fortune*. M.Chelli, *Etude sur la collaboration de Massinger avec Fletcher et son groupe* (Paris, 1926), pp.55-58; Fleay, *Biog. Chron.*, I, 203-4; *Eliz. Stage*, III, 227.
26. *Henslowe Papers*, Article 100, p.84; Article 82, p.74; Article 83, pp.74-5. It is difficult to determine whether one or more plays is involved in this Field-Daborne-Henslowe correspondence. Daborne was also involved



in writing *The Arraignment* and *Machiavel and the Devil* (both non-extant) for Henslowe. Greg suggests that the play Field refers to in his letter about the 'plott' (Article 100), is the same as the one mentioned in the tripartite letter (Article 68) of July 1613, and he takes Daborne's letters of 16 and 30 July 1613 (Articles 82 and 83) as also referring to this play. Bentley assumes at least two separate plays, one by Field, Massinger, Fletcher and Daborne (Articles 68 and 76) and one by Field and Daborne alone (Articles 100, 82 and 83). Article 76 is a further letter from Daborne to Henslowe demanding 'as much mony as mr messenger'. *Henslowe Papers*, pp.70-71. Bentley, *Profession*, p.212. A still useful account of Daborne's life, including transcripts of relevant letters to Henslowe, can be found in Swaen's introduction to his reprint of the plays. 'Robert Daborne's Plays', *Anglia*, 20 (1898), 153-256. For a more recent account see Donald Lawless 'Robert Daborne', in *Jacobean and Caroline Dramatists*, edited by Fredson Bowers, *Dictionary of Literary Biography*, 58 (Detroit, 1987), pp.50-59.

27. *Jac. and Car. Stage*, III, pp.351, 415-17; Greg, I, 62; Andrew Clark, 'An Annotated list of lost Domestic Plays, 1578-1624, *RORD*, 18 (1975), 29-44 (p.39).
28. For a full account of the date and provenance of these lists, and a discussion of their status see Baldwin Maxwell, 'The Alternate Titles, Dramatis Personae and List of Actors appearing in the Second Folio', in *Studies in Beaumont, Fletcher and Massinger* (Chapel Hill, 1939), 1-13 (pp.7-13). See also T.W.Baldwin, *The Organization and Personnel of the Shakespearian Company* (New York, 1927). The two non King's Men lists are attached to *The Honest Man's Fortune* and *The Coxcomb*. Sykes, Oliphant and Fleay are all over-reliant on the actor lists.
29. *The Wild Goose Chase* was first published in quarto in 1652 in an edition apparently prepared for actors. The actor list relating to a 1631 revival found its way into 'Beaumont and Fletcher' F. 1679. Moseley explains its absence from F. 1647 in 'The Stationer to the Readers', the preface to that volume.
30. 'Beaumont and Fletcher', F.1679. sig. A-A1v.
31. Aston Cokayne, *Small Poems of Divers Sorts: A Chain of Golden Poems* (London, 1658), pp.91-93.
32. Fleay, 'Metrical Tests'. Interestingly Nathan Drake had proposed Field as one of the co-authors of plays in the volume along with Massinger and Rowley as early as 1819. *Shakespeare and his Times* (London, 1819, Paris, 1838), pp.603-4.
33. W.W.Appleton, *Beaumont and Fletcher, A Critical Study* (London, 1956), p.81.



34. Alfred Harbage, *Annals of English Drama, 975-1700*, revised by S.Schoenbaum (London, 1964), third edition revised by Sylvia Stoler Wagonheim (New York and London, 1989). Dates and provenances given in this thesis are from this publication. The date Field started writing plays is some time between 1609 and 1611 (see note 23). In his commendatory verses to *The Faithful Shepherdess* Field indicates that he is not yet a writer of plays. His own 'unknowne name and muse...is not yet growne to strengthe'. The quarto of *The Faithful Shepherdess* must date sometime between 22 December 1608 and 14 January 1610 when its publishers were in partnership. John Fletcher, *The Faithful Shepherdess*, edited by Cyrus Hoy in Bowers, III, 483-612 (pp.489-90). Field's playwriting career would have ended in 1619 or 1620, at his death. See my discussion in Part 1 and Brinkley, p.14.
  
35. For the suggestion that their movement was illicit see John Freehafer, 'The Contention for *Bussy D'Ambois*, 1622-1641', *Theatre Notebook*, 23 (1968-9), 61-69.
  
36. *A Christian Turn'd Turke* is reprinted in Swaen (1898); *The Poor-Mans Comfort*, edited by Kenneth Palmer, Malone Society (Oxford, 1954 (1955)). *The Faithful Shepherdess* was published with title page and front matter that establish Fletcher's authorship. The clear linguistic patterns of the other plays make attribution to Fletcher alone totally convincing (Hoy, I, p.132). The suggestion of the 'disintegrators' that Field had some hand in *Bonduca* can be safely ignored, since it is rendered unlikely by the play's provenance and Hoy's linguistic analysis. *Bonduca*, edited by Cyrus Hoy, in Bowers, IV, 149-259; *The Woman's Prize*, edited by Fredson Bowers, in Bowers, IV, 1-154; *Valentinian*, edited by Robert K.Turner Jnr., in Bowers, IV, 261-414; *The Chances*, edited by George Walton Williams, in Bowers, IV, 541-645; *The Mad Lover*, edited by Robert Kean Turner, in Bowers, V, 1-149; *The Loyal Subject*, edited by Fredson Bowers in Bowers V, 151-288; *The Humorous Lieutenant*, edited by Cyrus Hoy, in, Bowers, V, 289-440; *Women Pleased*, edited by Hans Walter Gabler, in Bowers, V, 441-538; *The Island Princess*, edited by George Walton Williams in Bowers, V, 539-670; *The Pilgrim*, edited by Cyrus Hoy in Bowers, VI, 111-224; *The Wild Goose Chase*, edited by Fredson Bowers, in Bowers, VI, 225-353; *Monsieur Thomas*, edited by Hans Walter Gabler, in Bowers, IV, 415-540.
  
37. *Philaster*, edited by Robert K.Turner in Bowers, I, 367-540; *The Maids Tragedy*, edited by Robert K.Turner in Bowers, II, 1-166, and edited by T.W.Craik, *The Revels Plays* (Manchester, 1988); *A King and No King*, edited by George Walton Williams, in Bowers, II, 167-314; *The Captain*, edited by L.A.Beaurline, in Bowers, I, 541-670; *The Scornful Lady*, edited by Cyrus Hoy, in Bowers, II, 449-565; *Henry VIII*, edited by Fredson Bowers, in, Bowers, VII, 1-144; *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, edited by Fredson Bowers, in Bowers, VII, 145-298.



38. Bertha Hensman, 'The Collaboration of Massinger and Fletcher' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oxford, 1960); *The Shares of Fletcher, Field and Massinger in Twelve Plays of the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon*, Jacobean Drama Studies, 6, 2 vols (Salzburg, 1974).
39. Hensman presumably means to give the title *The Fatal Ring* rather than *The Fatal Dowry* in this passage.
40. *The Noble Gentleman* cannot contain work by Field if L.A.Beaurline is correct in dating the whole play 1624-5. He disagrees with Hoy that the work is the result of shared authorship, later revised. Bowers, III, 113-223 (p.115). Neither would Field have had a share in a 1605-6 play, perhaps the original later revised by Fletcher. The title page of the 1639 quarto of *Wit without Money* attributes the play to 'Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher Gent'. Hoy finds the play the work of Fletcher 'and an unidentified reviser'. It is linguistically unlikely that the reviser was Field (Hoy, IV, 110-112). The play's most recent editor explains that it represents 'a lost original, wholly Fletcherian, version of around 1614...worked over by James Shirley' in 'around 1625'. *Wit without Money*, edited by Hans Walter Gabler, in Bowers, VI, 1-109 (p.5). *A Very Woman* is a Massinger revision of either a Fletcherian original (Hoy, II, 144) or of an original Fletcher and Massinger collaboration (Edwards, *Plays and Poems*, IV, 202). The most recent editor, Hans Walter Gabler, inclines to the latter, but in any case Field is not involved. *A Very Woman*, edited by Hans Walter Gabler in Bowers VII, 639-743. Oliphant's suggestion, later withdrawn, that Field had some part in *Love's Pilgrimage* is not acceptable. The text in 'Beaumont and Fletcher', F1 represents a prompt copy of the 1630s that has been heavily revised. The linguistic evidence is inconclusive though Hoy's attribution of the pre-revision play to Beaumont and Fletcher (Hoy, III, 85-106) is accepted by the play's most recent editor, L.A.Beaurline. Bowers, II, 567-695 (p.571); Oliphant, *Philological Quarterly*, (1930) p.7 and *Beaumont and Fletcher*, pp.431-439.
41. *Thierry and Theodoret*, edited by Robert K.Turner Jnr. in Bowers, III, 363-481; *The Little French Lawyer* in Waller, III, 373-454; *Sir John van Olden Barnavelt*, edited by T.H.Howard-Hill, Malone Society (Oxford, 1979 [1980]); *The Custom of the Country*, in Waller, I, 302-388; *The Double Marriage* in Waller VI, 321-407; *The False One* in Waller, III, 300-372.
42. *Eliz. Stage*, III, 225; Fleay, *Biog. Chron.*, I, 187; Oliphant, *Beaumont and Fletcher*, pp.249 and 348-53; *Philological Quarterly* (1930), p.7; Stationer's Register Entry 24 April 1615, Q1, 1615; Q2 1630 'written by Fran Beaumont & lo Fletcher'; *Cupid's Revenge*, edited by Fredson Bowers in Bowers II, 315-448.



43. 5 January, 1611/12; 1 January, 1612/13, and either 9 January or 27 February, 1612/13. *Eliz. Stage*, III, 225.
44. James E. Savage, 'The Date of Beaumont and Fletcher's *Cupid's Revenge*', *ELH*, 15 (1948), 286-94.
45. 'The only conclusions we can reach concerning the authorship of *Wit at Several Weapons* must be based on its only extant text, and the extant text represents, in all essential respects, the work of Middleton and Rowley (Hoy, V, 89-92 (p.92)). *Eliz. Stage*, III, 232. Robert Kean Turner, the most recent editor, assigns the play to Middleton and Rowley, in Bowers, VII, 299-424.
46. *The Second Maidens Tragedy*, edited by Anne Lancashire, *The Revels Plays* (Manchester, 1978), p.17, pp.22-23.
47. Hoy finds it 'hard to establish Middleton's claim...on the basis of linguistic evidence alone' but concludes that 'Middleton's hand in the extant text is decidedly the predominant one' (Hoy, V, 92-96 (p.92 and p.96)); Jackson finds the play 'almost entirely Middleton's' (p.142). *The Nice Valour; or, The Passionate Madman*, edited by George Walton Williams, in Bowers, VII, 425-512.
48. Thomas Middleton, *Hengist, King of Kent; or, The Mayor of Queenborough*, edited by R.C. Bald (New York and London, 1938).
49. Elmer Edgar Stoll dates *Appius and Virginia* 1623-1639 as does H.D. Sykes. Henry Gray argues for a very early collaboration, c.1603-4. Elmer Edgar Stoll, *John Webster; The Periods of his Work* (Boston, 1905) p.3, pp.193-205; H.D. Sykes, 'An Attempt to Determine the Date of Webster's *Appius and Virginia*', *Notes and Queries*, 127, (1913) 401-3; Henry D. Gray, '*Appius and Virginia* by Webster and Heywood', *Studies in Philology*, 24 (1927), 275-89.
50. Elliot Hill supposes that it is probable that 'we have in *Nero* the single production of some highly talented playwright who will probably remain anonymous...the authorship of *Nero* remains obscure'. *Nero*, edited by Elliot McNeal Hill (New York and London, 1979), pp.xiv-v.
51. Hill discusses the conflict between the date suggested by internal allusions, 1624, and the date dictated by the quotation from *The Little French Lawyer*, pre-1619. He leaves the matter unresolved, but seems to favour Bentley's notion of later interpolations by actors, and hence the earlier date. G. Blakemore Evans, 'Note on Fletcher and Massinger's *Little French Lawyer*', *Modern Language Notes*, 5 (1937), 406-7.
52. John Marston and William Barksted, *The Insatiate Countess*, edited by Giorgio Melchiori, *The Revels Plays* (Manchester, 1984), p.11.



53. Lake, *'Insatiate Countess'*, p.170.
54. *The Costlie [sic] Whore*, edited by A.H.Bullen, *A Collection of Old English Plays*, 4 vols (London, 1882-5), IV, 219-98; *Swetnam the Woman Hater arraigned by Women*, edited by A.B.Grosart, *Occasional Issues of Unique or Very Rare Books*, 14 (Manchester, 1880); *If it be not Good the Devil is in it: If This be not a Good Play the Devil is in it*, in *The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker*, edited by Fredson Bowers, 4 vols (Cambridge, 1953-61), III, 113-223; *The Two Noble Ladies and the Converted Conjuror*, edited by Rebecca G.Rhoads, *Malone Society* (Oxford, 1930); *The Virgin Martyr* in *The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker*, III, 365-480.
55. The tripartite letter is reproduced as Plate XIII, in *English Literary Autographs, 1550-1650*, edited by W.W.Greg (Oxford, 1932). Rebecca Rhoads includes facsimiles of the *Two Noble Ladies* manuscript in her edition.
56. Hoy, IV, pp.108-10. The external evidence is useful here. In his Office Book for 11 May 1633, Herbert records the receipt of two pounds for licensing 'a play of Fletchers corrected by Shirley called The Night Walkers'. *The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert, Master of the Revels, 1623-1673*, edited by Joseph Quincey Adams (New Haven, 1917), p.34. *The Night Walker*, edited by Cyrus Hoy, in Bowers, VII, 513-637.
57. *Preist the Barber* appears as MS 2203.2 in the Folger Shakespeare Library in the volume *Cambridge Dramatic and Poetic Miscellany* (c.1615-c.1630). The handwriting is at first glance similar to Field's but there are several points of divergence which make me confident the manuscript is not in Field's hand. The most obvious are the letters 'h', 'p' and 'k', Field's distinctive 'th' form, and capital 'I'.
58. For editions of these plays see Peery, Gerritsen, Edwards and Waller as given on List of Abbreviations.
59. *Charlemagne; or, The Distracted Emperor*, edited by John Henry Walter, *Malone Society* (Oxford, 1937 (1938)); *The Birth of Merlin*, edited by C.F.Tucker Brooke, in *The Shakespeare Apocrypha* (Oxford, 1908, reprinted 1918) pp.349-382, discussed by Brooke, pp.xlv-xlvii; *The Coxcomb*, edited by Irby B.Cauthen Jr., in Bowers, I, 261-366; *The Faithful Friends*, edited by G.M.Pinciss and G.R.Proudfoot, *Malone Society* (London, 1970); *The Beggars Bush*, edited by J.H.Dorenkamp (The Hague, 1967) and by Fredson Bowers, in Bowers, III, 225-362; *Rollo, Duke of Normandy; or, The Bloody Brother*, edited by John Jump (Liverpool, 1948).
60. W.W.Greg discusses methods of determining authorial and prompt copy in *The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare: A Survey of the Foundations*



of the Text, third edition (Oxford, 1954), pp.36, 40 and *passim*. The recently discovered Melbourne fragment, apparently authorial foul papers, combines imperative and indicative stage directions. 'Hee reades the Prince attentively marking him' is followed a few lines later by 'read againe' in just the way found in Field's texts. As Hammond and Delvecchio point out, the author of the Melbourne fragment writes directions that resemble prompt book *and* authorial copy in what is clearly foul papers. See the diplomatic transcript in Antony Hammond and Doreen Delvecchio, 'The Melbourne Manuscript and John Webster: A Reproduction and Transcript', *Studies in Bibliography*, 41 (1988), 1-32 (pp.24-28, p.5).

61. 'Academic' conventions include block entries at the beginning of scenes, and continental scene divisions neither of which Field uses. These Latin directions are in addition to the conventional *Exit* and *Exeunt* and *Omnes*, and Latin scene headings.
62. Some of the directions in *Bussy D'Ambois* are in a mixture of Latin and English. Nicholas Brooke points out that these are more likely to be Chapman's than the book keeper's. The quarto was set from authorial copy. *Bussy D'Ambois*, edited by Nicholas Brooke, The Revels Plays (London, 1964), reprinted Manchester, 1979), pp.lxi-lxii.
63. Pits and Donner are not recorded by Edwin Nungezer, *A Dictionary of Actors* (New Haven, 1929) nor by *Eliz. Stage* or *Jac. and Car. Stage*.
64. The account which follows summarises Hoy's findings and supplements them by reference to the tables of Lake and Jackson and my own observations.
65. See the facsimile of the tripartite letter, Plate XIII (Greg, *Eng. Lit. Autographs*) and letters transliterated by Greg, *Henslowe Papers*, Article 68, p.65; Article 69, p.67; Article 100, p.84.
66. These are just a few of many examples.
67. For a discussion of Ralph Crane's scribal habits see F.P.Wilson, 'Ralph Crane, Scrivener to the King's Players', *Library*, 7 (1926), 194-215.
68. Further examples are provided by *Weathercock*, II.1, III.1, and III.2 and *Amends*, II.2, III.2, III.3.
69. T.W.Craik in his discussion of Chaucer's *The Merchant's Tale* uses this phrase. *The Comic Tales of Chaucer* (London, 1964), p.153.

### CHAPTER 3: *The Fatal Dowry*



Of all the plays in which it may be supposed Field collaborated none offers fewer problems of ascription than *The Fatal Dowry*. Early records of the play do not mention its authors but the title page of the first quarto, published in 1632 by Francis Constable, following its entry in the Stationers' Register on 30 March in the same year, states that it was 'written by P.M. and N.F.' It was a King's Men's play.<sup>1</sup> The inclusion of *The Fatal Dowry* in the Harbord volume of 1633 confirms its attribution to Massinger.<sup>2</sup> Presumptive evidence for identifying 'N.F.' as Nathan Field is very strong. As I have shown, he has a known and well documented history of collaboration with Massinger. He was a member of the King's Men. In the absence of any plausible alternative his part authorship of *The Fatal Dowry* is generally accepted, and is consonant with the agreed date for the play.<sup>3</sup>

The *terminus a quo* is likely to be late 1617 since there is an internal allusion in Act III to Daborne's entering the priesthood (*Fatal Dowry*, III.1.321). Recently discovered evidence suggests that this event occurred after 28 November 1617 but before February 1618.<sup>4</sup> Other internal allusions to new freedoms for Jesuits, the 'Infanta Queen of Europe' and to a picture of Thomas Coryat all suggest a date around this time (*Fatal Dowry*, II.2.111; IV.1.68; II.2.184; Edwards, p.3). Lockert and Dunn both, independently, suggest 1619. Dunn's conclusion, based 'in the absence of external or any more positive evidence' on Massinger's style' does not contradict that from Field's, though the stylistic closeness of *The Fatal Dowry* and Field's unaided work indicates a slightly earlier date (Dunn, p.1).<sup>5</sup>

The only substantive text is the quarto of 1632. Philip Edwards has described, in detail, the characteristics of John Norton's two compositors. Two distinct and contrasting patterns, one with infrequent use of the apostrophe in participles and an excess of unusual forms, and another with many apostrophes and normalised spellings, must be compositorial since

they coincide with bibliographic not dramatic units. Yet it is fair to assume that many authorial characteristics have survived in the extant text. The copy text seems to have been 'the foul papers of the two dramatists, or, conceivably, a transcript of them' (Edwards, I, 6). The printed quarto allows the respective shares of Field and Massinger to be distinguished quite readily.

II.1, II.2 and IV.1 can be assigned with some degree of confidence to Field. So can virtually all of III.1 apart from a short section early in the scene. Though some critics divide III.1 between Field and Massinger more evenly, I am reasonably certain that Field was responsible for Romont's encounter with Novall and his coterie. The word play on 'curry' and 'break' (334-5, 336-7), the sudden presence of oaths (325, 335) and the energetic stage action suggest Field's authorship. The syntactical looseness of Romont's speech is less like Massinger's than Field's. The stage direction *Manent. Char. Rom.* is in Field's usual manner. All these indicate that Act III should be divided at line 315 at the entry of Novall Junior and his companion, rather than at 343.

#### (i) *Linguistic*

Massinger's linguistic pattern is very distinctive and can be readily distinguished from Field's (Hoy, I and IV). Only in their use of *hath* do Massinger and Field coincide: otherwise their preferences diverge. Massinger avoids *ye*, Field uses it regularly alongside *you*. Massinger prefers *them* to Field's *'em*. Massinger avoids contracted forms like *ith*, *oth*, *h'as* and *'s* (for *his*). These are popular with Field.

Analysis of the distribution of linguistic forms in *The Fatal Dowry* yields the following clear results. The linguistic pattern composed of



elements I have identified as Field's can be seen clearly in II.1, II.2 and IV.1. It is also present in most of III.1. IV.1 is unique in its use of contracted *-ee* forms, *a* (for *on*), *oth* and *othe*, but it is linked to II.1 and to II.2 by the presence of *ith* and *ha'*, and to II.2 by *betwixt/twixt*. The only other occurrence of *ha'* is in III.1. *'s* (for *his*) occurs only in II.1 and II.2. Apart from two occurrences of *y'are* in IV.2, the only occurrences of *ye* or *y'* are in II.1, II.2, III.1 and IV.1. *Th'art* is present in II.2 and *thou'rt* in III.1. The absence of *them* in IV.1 indicates clearly Field's preference for *em* and *em* also predominates in Act II. As one might expect the distribution of *hath*, a form used indifferently by Field and Massinger, is inconclusive. Otherwise the linguistic evidence is strongly in favour of Field's having written II.1, II.2, most of III.1 and IV.1, where Massinger was responsible for the rest of the play.

## (ii) Prosodic

Variations in the use of prose, blank verse and rhyme support Field's authorship of Acts II.1, II.2, III.1 and IV.1. The only extended passages of prose occur in II.2 and IV.1. The modulations between prose and verse in II.2 after the exit of Florimel are particularly distinctive. Scene endings throughout the play (apart from IV.3 and V.2) are consistently marked by rhyming couplets. Clearly it is not possible to differentiate between Field and Massinger here. But other uses of rhyme are strikingly different. Some scenes (I.1, IV.3, IV.4, V.1 and V.2) have no rhyme at all, apart from their final couplets. Others (II.1, II.2, III.1 and IV.1) use rhyme extensively to end speeches, mark exits or for gnomic utterances. Rhyme clinches Pontalier's argument and marks his exit (IV.1.113; IV.1.124). Prose is the medium of the

gentle satire at the opening of IV.1. The confrontations of Romont with Novall are in verse. Such variety is what one expects from Field.

### (iii) *Textual and Accidental*

The division of shares that I have suggested receives some support from variants in the play's orthography not obviously coincident with compositorial stints. Of the five variant spellings for the names of the central protagonist *Charaloyes*(4), *Charaloys* (12) and *Charloyes* (4) have endings with *y* while *Charalois* (12) and *Charolois* (6) form the endings with *i*. Unfortunately the name does not occur in IV.1, IV.3 or V.1, but nonetheless their distribution is indicative. Act 1 can be sharply distinguished from Act II. *Charloyes* is confined to Act 1, and the remaining occurrences in this act are also *y* forms apart from a single *Charalois* in a stage direction in I.2. By contrast, all six *Charolois* appear in Act II, as do three of the twelve *Charalois* in the play. There are no occurrences of *y* forms at all. The pattern is less clear in the rest of the play, though Act III is dominated by *y* forms, particularly in its early section. Of the nine occurrences of the name here only two are not formed with *y*. In the rest of the play the distribution seems indifferent. In IV.2 there are two *Charaloys* and one *Charalois*; in IV.4 two *Charalois* to one *Charaloys*. Of the seven forms in V.2 there are four *Charaloys* and three *Charalois*.<sup>6</sup>

*Dijon* and its variants are also worthy of comment. The unusual *Digum* and *Dijum* mark II.2, distinguishing this scene from I.2 and V.1 where the text read *Dijon*. The *Dijon* at II.1.100 confuses a convenient



distinction however. Unfortunately there are no other occurrences of the name in the text.

II.2 can be further distinguished from both scenes of Act I by the spellings *bankrupt* (II.2.272; E3v) as against *banquerout* and *banquerouts* (I.1.127, B3; I.2.88, C1v), and from IV.2 by the variants *Aymour* (II.2.123; E1v) and *Aymeire/Aymiere* (IV.2.10 33 SD, H4v). IV.1 shares II.2's preference for *Aymour* (IV.1.ODS, 8, H1r). Thus the distribution of *Charalois/Charolois*, *Dijum/Digum*, '*bankrupt*' and *Aymour* links II.2 with IV.1 and separates both from Act 1, IV.2 and Act V. The distribution of other textual features also supports the allocation of Act II, most of Act III and IV.1 to Field. It may be significant that errors like 'ye'are' (II.1, D3r), 'i'st' (III.1, G4v), ya're (IV.1, H3r) and an omission like 'tye' (II.2, E1r) occur where they do.<sup>7</sup> The use of brackets is frequent throughout the text and shows no significant pattern but the frequency of non-syntactical parentheses is heavily concentrated in those scenes where other evidence points to Field. Examples are II.1.3, 32, 34, 35, 118; II.2.51, 73, 206; III.1.427; IV.1, 119, 181.

One further textual feature suggests authorial allocation. We know from the *Believe As You List* manuscript that Massinger favours the careful indication of new scenes in addition to regular act divisions. Field in his unaided plays follows the more common method of noting only the beginning of each act. So it may be more than accidental that while Act II is not divided, what I take to be Massinger's stint in Act IV begins '*Scæna 2*', and that the rest of the play is divided into both acts and scenes, including an unnecessary '*Scæna 3*' in Act V. However, a convenient distinction is blurred by the fact that Act 1, an act I also take to be Massinger's, is not so divided.

The presence of Latin stage directions is not consonant with other indications since *Exeunt omnes praeter Roch & Baumont* occurs in I.2 (D1r)

in a scene with no other Fieldian characteristics. The three other examples are in scenes that can on other grounds be attributed to Field - II.2, III.1 and IV.1. Though this use of Latin cannot be said to distinguish Field's work from Massinger's the precise formula used in III.1 and IV.1 is comparable with Field's usual practice.

*Exeunt. Manent Char. Rom.*

*Exeunt. Manent Nov. Rom.*

*(Fatal Dowry, III.1, G2v; IV.1, H3v)*

One cannot make too much of this, however, since the direction with *praeter* in the non Fieldian I.2 (D1r) is paralleled in II.2 in a scene I think to be his.

*Exeunt omnes, praeter Roch. Daug.*

*(Fatal Dowry, II.2.149, E1v)*

*Cant.* is an unusual stage direction that *The Fatal Dowry's* II.2 shares with *Amends for Ladies* (*Fatal Dowry*, II.2.123, E1v; *Amends*, IV.2.124, G1r).

#### (iv) *Theatrical*

Field's putative share of *The Fatal Dowry* can be readily distinguished from that of Massinger by the fullness of his stage directions. Of the thirty two directions that involve other than a simple entrance or exit, there are only three in Act I, five in IV.2 and three in IV.4.<sup>8</sup> There are none at all in



the final two scenes of the play in spite of the violent acts crucial to the denouement that occur in Act V, and in spite of the opportunities the ceremonial setting offers for spectacle and processional entries. The lengthy trial of Beaumelle before the blindfolded figure of Justice, her father, in the presence of Novall Junior's dead body, has the potential for exciting visual staging, but instead the interest of the scene is focussed on the moral debate which the trial embodies. The scene proceeds through dialectic not stage pictures. The stage directions for the bringing on of Novall Junior's body are perfunctory.

*Enter Charalois ,with Novals body, Beaumelle, Baumont.*

*(Fatal Dowry, IV.4.91.1.2, I3v)*

No attention here is given to the necessary attendants or to possible stage groupings. The entry of the judges in the final scene reads only

*Enter Du Croy, Charmi, Rochfort, Novall Se, Pontalier, Baumont.*

*(Fatal Dowry, V2.121; L1r)*

Even more striking is the omission of any kind of stage direction for Pontalier's killing Charalois, Romont's killing Pontalier, or Romont's subsequent arrest, all of which are clearly required by the dialogue and the dramatic action. By contrast the instructions for staging other parts of the play are full and detailed. The spatial relationships and behaviour of the actors are carefully specified.

*Enter Funerall. Body borne by 4. Captaines and Souldiers. Mourners. Scutcheons, and very good order. Charalois and Romont meet it. Charalois speaks, Romont weeping. Solemne musique. 3 creditors.*

*(Fatal Dowry, II.1.47, D2r)*

The actors are given plenty to do.

*Enter Novall, Ponta. Malotin. Lilad. Aymer. All salute.*

*(Fatal Dowry, II.2.310; E4r)*

Those not involved in the dialogue are given small stage business to fill out the scene.

*Lilad. Aym. trim Novall, whilst Bell her Lady.*

*(Fatal Dowry, II.2.79; D4v)*

An instruction to sing is given in Latin, *Cant.* just as in *Amends for Ladies*. Marginal notes suggest *He capers*, or *Drawes a pocket dag*, or *Drawes Inkehorne and paper* (*Fatal Dowry*, IV.1.71, H2r; IV.1.163, 176, H3v). An actor is instructed where his words should be addressed 'to his Mrs.' (*Fatal Dowry*, II.2.149, E1v). Costume and the manner of entry are prescribed.

*Enter Novall Junior, as newly dressed, a Taylor, Barber, Perfumer, Liladam, Aymour, Page.*

*(Fatal Dowry, IV.1, OSD; H1r)*

This opening of IV.1 parallels the opening of I.2 of *A Woman is a Weathercock* whose opening direction reads

*Enter Count Fredericke, a Taylor trussing him, attended by a Page.*

*(Weathercock, I.2.OSD; B3v)*

As the scene continues the page keeps up a satiric commentary. IV.1 of *The Fatal Dowry* not only repeats the effect from *A Woman is a Weathercock*



but develops it. The stage directions are full and carefully positioned so that the page's witty lines are reinforced by stage movements, as each character moves in turn.<sup>9</sup> The integration of dialogue and action, exactly presented in parallel, and the concern with grouping are typical of Field, and unlike what happens elsewhere in the play.

There are slight but significant differences between the ways that exits and entrances are handled in different parts of the play. Entrances that are anticipated by more than one line occur only in the parts of the play I can on other grounds attribute to Field. The handling of the funeral procession in II.1 is a good example, where Pontalier and Baumont comment on its approach two or three lines ahead. The early entry of Charalois and Baumont in III.1 and the extended opening of IV.1 are further examples.

In these scenes characters are identified and/or named within a few lines of entry, or even before they arrive on stage. During the dialogue the characters address each other by name more frequently than in the rest of the play. Similarly these scenes can be distinguished by the way exits are well motivated and emphasised with rhyme, verbal play or violent movement. Exits and entrances are covered by dialogue.

The story in some sections of the play is told as much through stage action as through the dialogue. Characteristically when Romont wishes to force Novall Junior to keep away from Beaumelle, the scene is of action not persuasive rhetoric. Massinger would never write

I will be your confounder, if you doe not.	<i>Drawes a</i>
Stirre not, nor spend your voyce.	<i>pocket dag.</i>

(*Fatal Dowry*, IV.1.163; H3v)

Characters in Massinger's 'drama of verbal interplay' always 'spend their voyces'.<sup>10</sup> In this scene the drawing of the pistol and the writing of the

confession convey meaning. The conflicting pressures on Novall are shown visually through hand properties, and by the brief inopportune appearance of Bellapert. What in a Massinger scene might have been a long soliloquy in which Novall Junior debated his moral predicament is reduced to its dramatic essentials.

<i>Bellapert</i>	..... My Lord away The Coach stayes: now have your wish and judge If I have beene forgetfull.
<i>Novall Junior</i>	Ha?
<i>Bellapert</i>	D'ee stand Humming and hawing now?
<i>Novall Junior</i>	Sweete wench I come.

(*Fatal Dowry*, IV.1.197; H4r)

Simplicity and brevity of expression at points of crisis are typical of Field's characters. The title of his first work seems to be present in the image used so poignantly by Beaumelle at the turning point in her life, 'Thy presence blows round my affections vane' and her fate is sealed in a single line (*Fatal Dowry*, II.2.337).

II.1, II.2, III.1 and IV.1 have a higher proportion of extended passages of dialogue involving more than three speakers than elsewhere in the play. Though the trial scenes are ostensibly ensemble scenes, their structure is determined by their legal setting, and the dialogue is confined to relatively few speakers as legal formalities dictate. The only two examples of undifferentiated group speech occur in II.2 (335, 339).

Asides are also frequent in these scenes. Apart from brief lines from Liladam, Aymour and Charalois in IV.2 and Act V, all the significant asides occur in II.2, III.1 and IV.1. The opening of IV.1 I cited earlier is an extended passage dependent on the page's direct address to the spectators. Romont



resorts to solo speech early in III.1 and it becomes more frequent later in the scene. Novall Junior soliloquises in IV.1. V.2 is the only other scene containing extended solo speech.

Paired songs are important in *The Fatal Dowry* and a direction reflecting the practice in the children's theatre parallels the call for music made by the Count at the end of Act II of *A Woman is a Weathercock*. Both demand music for the act.

*Here a passage over the Stage, while the Act is playing for the Marriage of Charalois with Beaumelle, &c.*

*(Fatal Dowry, II.21 Final SD, F1r)*

#### *(v) Literary*

Field writes dialogue that is easy for actors to speak. Syntactically his style is very different from Massinger's. Massinger favours very long periodic sentences with frequent, grammatically accurate parentheses. This sometimes makes his blank verse ponderous and inflexible, and prevents the dialogue seeming spontaneous. By contrast Field differentiates characters through language and the writing is nearer to naturalism even in the most formal of blank verse. There is a marked difference, for example, between the handling of verse in Act V, and in IV.1 of *The Fatal Dowry*, suggesting that these two scenes are by different playwrights. In IV.1 the cowardly sycophantic Liladam, the ingratiating Aymour, the blunt roughly spoken Pontalier and the impassioned Romont are represented in dialogue that modulates from verse to prose or hovers between them. None of the speeches is very long. Many are just one line or a shared line. For the most

part the dialogue is brisk and colloquial with the pattern of conversation captured by frequent interruptions. The serious moments are sustained in a competent, not overcomplicated blank verse. Pontalier's appeal to Novall, though verse, capitalises on <sup>normal</sup>~~nominal~~ speech rhythms.

Sir, would you be  
More curious in preserving of your honours  
Trim, 'twere more manly. I am come to wake  
Your reputation, from this lethargy  
You let it sleepe in, to perswade, importune  
Nay, to prouoke you, sir, to call to account  
This Collonell *Romont*, for the foule wrong  
Which like a burthen, he hath layd on you,  
And like a drunken porter you sleep under.

(*Fatal Dowry*, IV.1.93)

The speech, working by cumulation, is familiar and colloquial.

The verbal energy of Novall's refusal to marry

I marry? were there a Queene oth' world, not I.  
Wedlocke? no, padlocke, horslocke, I weare spurs  
To keepe it off my heeles;

(*Fatal Dowry*, IV.1.70)

translates into action. A parallel stage direction reads *He capers*.

Romont orders Novall's silence in equally vigorous language:

*Rom.* ...  
But not a word of it, 'tis Fairies treasure;  
Which but reueal'd, brings on the blabbers, ruine.  
Vse your youth better, and this excellent forme  
Heaven hath bestowed vpon you. So good morrow to your  
lordship.  
*Nou.* Good diuell to your rogueship. No man's safe:  
Ile have a cannon planted in my chamber, *Exit.*  
Against such roaring roagues.

(*Fatal Dowry*, IV.1.191, H4r)



The image of 'Fairies treasure', admittedly proverbial, is repeated from *A Woman is a Weathercock* (I.1.100). Characteristic of Field are the aggressive word play 'good morrow to your lordship...Good diuell to your rogueship' and the way the lines are manipulated around the exit.

Word play and the enjoyment of bad puns like the one on Colbran, 'hee'l make some of you smoake, I believe' (IV.1.129) are typical.

Literary parallels between certain scenes in *The Fatal Dowry* and Field's unaided plays are not hard to find. Favoured images from books (*Fatal Dowry*, III.1.467; IV.1.42-50), rivers meeting (*Fatal Dowry*, II.2.320) and trees (*Fatal Dowry*, II.1.1224; II.1.11; II.1.20; II.2.153) are common. Brinkley (p.88) and Peery (p.255) both cite

This is like gilded Tombes  
Compacted of Iet Pillars, Marble stones  
Which hide from stinking flesh and rotten bones.

(*Weathercock*, III.2.83)

and

The golden calfe that was an Idoll dect  
With Marble pillars, Iet and Porphyrie,  
Shall quickly both in bone and name consume,  
Though wrapt in lead, spice, Searecloth and perfume.

(*Fatal Dowry*, II.1.82)

as parallels. The use of rhyme also points to Field. Another parallel can be found between *A Woman is a Weathercock* and a passage in II.2 of *The Fatal Dowry*.

This heavenly piece, which Nature hauing wrought  
She lost her needle, and did then despaire  
Euer to work so liuely and so faire.

(*Fatal Dowry*, II.2.69)

Nature her selfe having made you, fell sicke  
In love with her owne worke, and can no more  
Make man so louelie...

(*Weathercock*, I.2.52)

The Count responds to Pendant's flattery: 'thou't make me dote upon myselfe' to which he replies '*Narcissus*, by this hand had farre less cause.' (*Weathercock*, I.2.69). Not unexpectedly, the collocation of 'dote' and 'Narcissus' reappears in the analogous scene in *The Fatal Dowry*. Aymour denies that the looking glass flatters Novall Junior.

Flatters, detracts, impayres, yet put it by;  
Lest thou deare Lord ( *Narcissus*-like) should doate  
Vpon thy selfe and dye; and rob the world  
Of natures copy that she workes forme by.

(*Fatal Dowry*, IV.1.64)

These parallels are those of context as well as of expression: the words belong to seductive flatterers whose motives are suspect. The setting and characterization are the same.

The concerns with clothing continue in a series of comments on how;

...one of the purles of his band was fallen (out of his reach) to order againe.

(*Amends*, III.3.102)

Vds light, my Lord, one of the purles of your band is (without all discipline falne) out of his ranke.

(*Fatal Dowry*, II.2.72)



Aymour complains of Romont's roughness: 'Plague on him, how he has crumpled our bands' (*Fatal Dowry*, IV.1.150) and a similar fray in *Amends for Ladies* is said 'to have spoild your cut-worke band' (*Amends*, IV.4.93). Pontalier attributes the refusal of Liladam and Aymour to fight to the fact that

...'twould spoyle their cloathes, and put their bands out of order.

(*Fatal Dowry*, II.2.100)

Further similarities can be found between the songs in *Amends for Ladies* (IV.1.55) and *The Fatal Dowry* (II.2.125) where the conventional image of the sun rising 'From the bright Radience of my M<sup>rs</sup> eyes' is used.<sup>11</sup> Again the parallel of language that Peery points out is far less important than the parallel of situation, and the fact that music is introduced into both plays to display the skill of the singer. In neither case does the expected serenader sing himself. Of other verbal parallels between *The Fatal Dowry* and Field's unaided work, Pontalier's description of the parasites, 'they skip into my Lords cast skins some twice a yeare' (*Fatal Dowry*, II.2.96) is strikingly similar to Pedant's description of how he survives

By undoing Taylors, and then my Lord (like a Snake) casts a sute  
euerie quarter which I slip into.

(*Weathercock*, II.2.112)

In its discussion of marriage II.2 of *The Fatal Dowry* repeats the opening scene of *Amends for Ladies* and here parallels of tone supplement merely verbal echoes

Is it not daily seene,  
Men take wives but to dresse their meate, to wash,

And starch their linnen: for the other matter  
Of lying with them, that's but when they please.

(*Amends*, I.1.29-32)

...the onely distinction betwixt a husband and a servant is: the  
first will lye with you when hee please; the last shall lye with  
you when you please...

(*Fatal Dowry*, II.2.45)

The women's conversation in *The Fatal Dowry* is clearly a development of the one in *Amends for Ladies* although its presentation is brisk bawdy prose and its characterisation are more naturalistically conceived. The satiric commentary is more naturally integrated into colloquial dialogue than the similar discussion in the formal debate of *Amends for Ladies*.

One further point needs to be made about verbal echoes. When Charalois chastises Romont with 'Away, thou curious impertinent' he is quoting the title of a possible source for *Amends for Ladies* (*Fatal Dowry*, III.1.442).<sup>12</sup>

Alongside *A Woman is a Weathercock's* 'plainlier' and 'safelier' and *Amends for Ladies'* 'cleanlier' we can set 'gladlier' (II.1.60). Examples of Field's self consciously etymological approach to vocabulary can be found in the use of 'participate' (II.2.301), 'exhaust' (II.1.101) and 'praecipice' (III.1.465). The adjective 'practic' recurs from *Amends for Ladies* in II.1.

An examination of the oaths and expletives used in *The Fatal Dowry* produces very clear results. Acts I, V and Act IV, apart from IV.1, are almost entirely free of these expressions. By contrast they are frequent in the rest of the play where they demonstrate Field's regular preferences: 'slight', 'By this light' and the curious 'Vds light', 'pish', and variants on 'humpe', 'hum, hum', 'Hump', 'Humph' (II.1.105; II.2.5, 34, 72; II.1.359; IV.1.86; II.2.58, 173; III.1.39; IV.1.85).



Sexual innuendo and bawdy are present only in scenes which seem to be Field's, notably in the conversation between Beaumelle's women, and in the tasteless jokes of the Page (*Fatal Dowry*, II.2, IV.1).

An early editor of *The Fatal Dowry*, Monck Mason, wrote

A critical reader will perceive that Rochfort and Charalois speak a different language in the Second and Third Acts, from that which they speak in the first and last, which are undoubtedly Massingers as is also Part of the Fourth Act, but not the whole of it.<sup>13</sup>

Nearly two hundred years later another editor made a similar point in referring to 'the ease with which any reader can distinguish the contributions of the two authors' (Dunn, p.1):

By and large, it is a fairly simple matter to distinguish on stylistic grounds the main author of each scene particularly since Massinger's voice (in extended passages at least) is unmistakable...

(Dunn, p.2)

It is my contention that the voice of Field is equally unmistakable and that in his shares of *The Fatal Dowry* it speaks out clearly.

This examination of *The Fatal Dowry* has led me to certain conclusions. The play can be easily divided into two contrasting authorial shares. There is considerable scholarly consensus<sup>5</sup> about this, the only point of disagreement being where to divide III.1. We know that one of these shares is Field's. The pattern of distribution of characteristics I have isolated as distinctively Fieldian coincides with one of these shares. It would seem, then, that the validity of my diagnostic tests for Field's presence has been strengthened and that I can now apply them with more confidence to plays of less overtly declared authorship.

## NOTES

1. *Jac. and Car. Stage*, I, 27-28; IV.783; *Greg, Bibliography*, I.41; *Arber*, IV.275.
2. The Harbord volume now in the Folger library contains manuscripts of Massinger's plays, some corrected in his hand. See *Edwards and Gibson*, I, xlv.
3. There are four twentieth century editions of *The Fatal Dowry*: by C.L.Lockert Jnr (Lancaster, Pa., 1918), by T.A.Dunn (Edinburgh, 1969), by Carol Bishop (Salzburg, 1976) and by Philip Edwards (Oxford, 1976).
4. Donald Lawless, 'Robert Daborne', in *Jacobean and Caroline Dramatists*, edited by Fredson Bowers, *Dictionary of Literary Biography*, 58 (Detroit, 1987), pp.50-59 (pp.57-58).
5. Arguments from style alone about dating are not very reliable but it might be worth noting that *Amends for Ladies* was published in a carefully prepared quarto in 1618. Reminiscences of this work in *The Fatal Dowry* might be due in part, to this, rather than to its composition in 1611 or so.
6. Carol Bishop suggests that the variations in the name of the hero are compositorial since, she notes, the speech headings read *Cha.* after signature H4v and *Char.* up to G4v. Signature G is mixed (p77). But these differences are not consistent with variations in stage directions or forms of the name within the text, and there seems little correlation with the compositorial stints identified by Edwards. Bishop is mistaken in her assertion that 'in Act I the invariable spelling is *Charaloyes*'. The variant *Charloyes* appears three times in Act I (B1v, B4, C3). We also have *Charalois* on C. Signature F is interesting. The long stage direction which ends Act II has *Charalois*. In the text of the opening of Act III on the same page we have *Charaloyes*.
7. The context suggests that *t'ye* is the correct reading. Edwards reads 'tye' and this is followed by Bishop. But the notion of 'tying' the hand seems to make no sense, and the dramatic logic of the scene is best served by the amorous gesture. Beaumelle continues:  
  
    'How your lips blush, in scorne that they should pay  
    Tribute to hands, when lips are in the way!' (Fatal Dowry, II.2.118)
8. It is not likely that the directions and notes are the book-keeper's since they occur so discrepantly between scenes.



9. In the quarto the precise directions are set out in the margin alongside the relevant speeches, an effect obscured in Edwards' edition by his grouping all the stage directions at the opening of the scene.
10. The phrase is Dunn's in *Philip Massinger* (London, 1957), p.85.
11. One should not make too much of this since the status and authenticity of the songs is not absolutely certain.
12. See Abraham S.Wolf Rosenbach, "'The Curious Impertinent" in English Dramatic Literature before Shelton's Translation of *Don Quixote*', *Modern Language Notes*, 17 (1902), 357-367.
13. Cited by C.L.Lockert in his edition of *The Fatal Dowry*, p.9.

## CHAPTER 4: *The Honest Man's Fortune*



The difficulties of the authorial problems presented by *The Honest Man's Fortune* are exacerbated by its existence in two versions; one a 1624/5 King's Men's manuscript whose front matter carries no ascription, and the other printed in the Beaumont and Fletcher first folio of 1647. In the Stationers' Register relating to this publication *The Honest Man's Fortune* is among the thirty or so plays entered to Humphrey Moseley as being by 'mr Beamont & mr fflesher'.<sup>1</sup> Neither of these attributions is accurate.

The manuscript, Dyce 9, in its present form can be fairly precisely dated. On its final leaf is the autograph licence of Sir Henry Herbert:

This play, being an olde One and thir Originall lost was reallowed by mee, this 8. Februar. 1624 Att the Intreaty of mr <Taylor>.

Damage to the original manuscript has made it necessary for the name 'Taylor' to be supplied in a modern hand, but this is clearly correct since the corresponding entry taken from Sir Henry Herbert's Office book reads

For the kings company. An olde play called The Honest mans fortune, the originall being lost, was re-allowed by mee at Mr Taylors intreaty and on condition to give mee a booke this 8 Februar. 1624.<sup>2</sup>

Whether the manuscript was freshly written in 1624/5 or not, there can be little doubt that Dyce 9 was newly marked up by the King's Men's book-keeper for a King's Men's performance in 1624/5. The casting of some minor parts is shown by the presence of the names 'G.Ver[non]' and 'I.Rho[des]' as the creditors in I.1, and 'George Rick[ner]' as the servant in I.2, actors thought to have been in the 1624/5 King's Men Company and not before.<sup>3</sup> Theatrical cuts marked in the manuscript also indicate preparation for a 1624/5 performance.<sup>4</sup> This was quite clearly a revival since the legend on the

manuscript tells us that it was earlier 'Plaide in the yeare 1613'.<sup>5</sup> The group of actors named on the actor list attached to the play in the Beaumont and Fletcher second folio of 1679 can be found together in or around 1613 as members of the Lady Elizabeth's Men.<sup>6</sup> The manuscript, then, leads us to two different dates and provenances for the piece: King's, 1624/5 and Lady Elizabeth's 1613. The identification of the scribe as Edward Knight does little to resolve this dilemma. He was a King's Men's book-keeper in 1624/5. He was associated with the Lady Elizabeth's company in 1615 (Gerritsen, pp.xxi-xxviii).

Both texts of *The Honest Man's Fortune* are substantive. The folio text cannot have been set up directly from the manuscript since it has one extra episode, variants in the names of two characters and significant differences in the final scene.<sup>7</sup> Yet manuscript and folio are closely related. An impressive array of evidence cited by Gerritsen confirms Greg's supposition that both derive from the same copy text. Concurrent errors imply identical orthographic and paleographic features of the copy for both texts (Greg, *Dramatic Documents*, p.290; Gerritsen, pp.xl-lxvii).

Unluckily for my purposes, evidence for determining the exact nature of this copy text is contradictory and inconsistent. Clearly both extant texts represent versions of at least one remove from foul papers, since Dyce 9 is demonstrably a scribal copy, and the folio is printed. Both texts show signs of playhouse intervention. Yet the usual signs of foul papers - textual corruption; anomalies; irregularities of speech prefixes; permissive, descriptive and inadequate stage directions - can all be found in both texts.

In this confused situation I have not been afraid to be eclectic in accepting readings from both versions, though I often favour the folio as a less heavily edited text. In this I sometimes take the opposite view to Gerritsen. The difference reflects our purposes. We know *a priori* that Dyce



9 is a scribal transcript with extensive intervention in stage directions, grammatical forms, spelling and other accidentals. For an editor, especially one aiming to make a previously inaccessible text available, this may not be overwhelmingly important. But authorship studies are as much, if not more, concerned with accidentals as substantives. Thus, proceeding negatively, I often prefer the folio text.

The amount of editing the folio text has received is not easy to determine. The most obvious difference between it and the manuscript is the presence of V.3. Gerritsen writes of this scene

...it has no bearing on the action and seems to have been added largely for reasons of piquancy. The MS shows that for the setting out of the banquet it could be dispensed with...

(Gerritsen, p.171)

I take the opposite view. Besides providing comic respite and building up tension before the final denouement, it is needed for eminently practical theatrical reasons: the servants' conversation covers the time taken in bringing on the furniture and laying out the food. It thus prevents any hiatus in the action which is continuous with what Gerritsen marks as a separate scene, V.4.

I think the folio's variant ending of the play is also closer to authorial intention than the manuscript's. The bawdy stage action demanded by Lapoop's instruction to Laverdine to search Veramour's breeches further has evidently been 'cleaned up' in the manuscript version. This would be in line with other features of the manuscript, most notably the obliteration of a passage about male stews, which suggest that Dyce 9 was subject to censorship. Here, as in other instances, the folio prints a full text.

Gerritsen accepts some readings from Dyce 9 in preference to those in

the folio on metrical grounds. He selects the smoother reading. But, as McKerrow in another context points out, metrical correctness is not necessarily the sign of authorial presence.

...as a matter of fact such 'improvement' is the easiest of all forms of revisions for any person with a normal appreciation of rhythm... [Where the text is] revised to produce mechanical correctness in minor matters which do not affect its dramatic or poetical quality...we may assume with some confidence that the author had no hand in the revisions...<sup>8</sup>

Since Gerritsen's examples depend on relineation of both manuscript and folio texts, and since uniformly metrical regularity is scarcely a feature of either, Gerritsen's hypothesis about the editing of the folio cannot go unquestioned. When taken with the slight weakening of sense from concrete to abstract expressions in the examples he gives, it is as likely that the manuscript readings represent 'smoothings' by Knight, as that the folio has been edited.<sup>9</sup> Here a distinction must be made between deliberate alterations and compositorial errors, omissions and insertions due to paleographic difficulties or damage to copy.<sup>10</sup> Other signs of genuine editing detected by Gerritsen are only slightly more convincing. There has been some kind of intervention in the 'male stews' passage the manuscript obliterates, and at the end of Act III where the folio alteration makes intelligible a bawdy joke that would have been quite clear on stage.<sup>11</sup> The same thinking may be behind the folio expansion of 'this' to 'this silken one' (p.148) and the clarification of an earlier ambiguity at II.4.121. The weaker reading of the folio's 'proues a Gentleman' (p.149) for the manuscript's 'proues a griffin gent' (III.1.82-3) may, as Gerritsen suggests, represent editorial softening, but it seems as likely, in view of the misreading in the previous line, to be caused by the compositor's difficulty with his copy. I think the same may be true of another variant. At IV.2.68 the manuscript gives us



thou shalt haue strokes & strokes, thou glorious voice,  
tell thou bee'st thinner ayer then that thou talkest.

In the folio this appears as

Thou shalt haue stroakes, and stroakes, thou glorious man,  
Till thou breathst thinner ayre then that thou talkest.

I am not convinced by Gerritsen's suggestion that the folio represents a conscious alteration by an editor of an obscure passage (Gerritsen, p.165). The folio reading is not 'eminently sensible' and the manuscript reading is intelligible though odd. On balance, then, I find little editorial interference in the folio text, though naturally there are several places where obvious compositorial errors mean that the manuscript has better readings.

We know that Dyce 9 is an edited text since Knight's interventions and those of an unknown stage reviser can be observed or inferred at many points. Such interventions inevitably obscure anomalies relevant to the authorship question. Where, for example, the folio text gives the name of the lady the false suitors wish to pursue as *Annabella* (p.155) the manuscript has *Lamira* (II.2.107). In the rest of both texts she is consistently *Lamira*. Directions are rewritten to accommodate cuts as, for example, at III.1.138-44 where the music and song called for in the folio are marked for omission and a new entry is provided for 'Montaigne'. At IV.1.136 Veramour's offer 'and Ile sing to you again', present in the folio text (p.164) does not appear in the manuscript suggesting that the latter has been prepared for a non-singing page.<sup>12</sup> A new line of dialogue has been added by a stage reviser after III.3.8, 'but I may spare my labour heeres my lady' where Knight has brought up the stage direction from line 36, to bridge the gap caused by the marking of lines 9-38 for omission. At IV.1.192 the same stage reviser replaces a line

accidentally omitted by Knight. Knight sometimes changes lame readings which appear in the folio as in III.2.42-43 or makes them more dignified as at III.2.102 (p.161). He occasionally corrects grammar (IV.1.147, III.1.73) and expands contractions (V4, 18, II.2.51, 54). He obliterates passages and often relineates. He experiments with different ways of spelling the same sound (III./3.198; Gerritsen, p.157) and standardises the spelling of some proper names (e.g. *Longavile*). Knight's punctuation sometimes obscures possible authorial punctuation as in his substitution of a full stop for a dash at the end of interrupted speeches at III.3.163 and IV.1.22. Clearly in this situation the manuscript may be further away from their common copy text than the folio though neither is entirely satisfactory for providing strong authorial evidence.

Before proceeding to an analysis of the internal evidence offered by the two texts, however unsatisfactory, I need to determine any external evidence for authorship that can be deduced from my account of the play's date, provenance and textual history. Fletcher has long been associated with the play though there is no exactly contemporary attribution. Gardiner, whose prefatory poem in the 1647 folio manages to include many of the folio's play titles, credits Fletcher alone with the authorship of *The Honest Man's Fortune*. The same is true of Kirkman's catalogue of plays attached to *Tom Tyler and his Wife* (1661).<sup>13</sup> Moseley's inclusion of 'Vpon an Honest Man's Fortune', verses by Fletcher, immediately after the play in the folio is suggestive, though there seems little connection, bar the title, between play and poem.

Other dramatists collaborating on plays for the Lady Elizabeth's Men in or before 1613, the manuscript's date of first performance, include Beaumont, to whom Moseley assigns the play, Massinger, Daborne and Field. There is no external evidence apart from the fallible Moseley attribution to associate Beaumont with the play at all. Fleay identifies the play mentioned in the



tripartite letter as *The Honest Man's Fortune* and this speculation is repeated by Chambers but there is no external evidence cited to support this notion.<sup>14</sup>

One feature of the play's performance history does suggest the likelihood of Field's being involved in the collaboration. He is already associated with the play via the actor list, though naturally involvement as an actor does not necessarily imply collaboration as a writer. It is a working hypothesis, however, that he was responsible for the unorthodox movement of this play with others from the Lady Elizabeth's Men's repertoire to that of the King's Men. When Taylor submitted Dyce 9 for licensing his claim that the original was lost might have concealed an illicit movement from one company to the other. This notion, explored by Freehafer, receives some support from Greg who argues that the copy underlying both folio and manuscript is 'some sort of stage version which came into the hands of the King's Men from the Lady Elizabeth's company' (Greg, *Dramatic Documents*, p.290).<sup>15</sup> Nathan Field, then, is connected albeit circumstantially with this play.

The printing history of the 1647 volume also offers support for the idea of Field's involvement in *The Honest Man's Fortune* since, despite subsequent rearrangement, it was originally associated with *Four Plays in One*, another work in which Field had a major share.<sup>16</sup>

The case for multiple authorship of *The Honest Man's Fortune* is very weak. Metrical tests have yielded no <sup>s</sup> consensus about the units of division they are supposed to demonstrate.<sup>17</sup> Fleay, for example, finds the same author responsible for Acts III and IV, while Boyle assigns them to different dramatists, and Oliphant further subdivides Act III, but adds Act II to Fleay's ascription.<sup>18</sup> Gerritsen attempts to rationalise the metrical tests by introducing some of his own (Gerritsen, p.lxxvii) but his findings from test for inversion, omission and addition do not tally with his findings based on



double endings. He finds, further, that the evidence from linguistic tests and parallel passages contradicts the metrical (Gerritsen, pp.lxviii-xciv). In this confusing state he gives Act IV to Field, Act V to Fletcher, Act I to Tourneur and 'leaves the problem of the second and third acts much where it was' (Gerritsen, p.xciii).<sup>19</sup>

There is nothing in the play's structure or style to suggest that the play has to be divided into distinct authorial shares except fallible metrical evidence. Gerritsen's tests are contradictory. Some slight inconsistencies in the text can be ignored. The *Annabella/Lamira* contradiction is trivial. The casual references of I.3 and II.2 are insignificant. The character has not yet appeared in the play. When she does she is consistently *Lamira*. Such careless inconsistency is not unknown in non-collaborative work. The Rosaline/Katherine confusions of *Love's Labour's Lost* immediately spring to mind. A second discrepancy, the profession of Lapoop as sea or land captain, can also be ignored since branches of the military profession were not necessarily so distinguished. Lapoop's captaincy belongs to the army or the navy as the dictates of comic effect demand. On his first appearance in II.2 Lapoop entertains Laverdine with increasingly implausible stories about the Siege of Brest. The punchline of the biggest joke in the scene depends on his being 'a Gentleman of a Company' (*Honest Man's Fortune*, II, p.155). Elsewhere the comic potential of a scene is exploited by his being a sea captain (IV, p.165; V, p.169, p.170). The comic handling is identical in all cases. In any case, a similar inconsistency can be found in a single scene within a few lines, where a single author must surely be responsible (*Honest Man's Fortune*, III, p.162).

No strong case, then, can be made for multiple authorship on the basis of inconsistency. Neither does the play break up into clear-cut scenic units containing easily identifiable and distinct patterns of linguistic preferences.



Cyrus Hoy supplies a useful corrective. He is

quite certain that there are not five authors present in the play; I am not even sure that there are four. I suspect that there are only three: Fletcher, Massinger and Field. Nearly everyone who has studied the play is willing to give Field the fourth act. I would give him a good deal more: all of acts one and two, and most of act three. I believe, indeed, that the play is largely his...<sup>20</sup>

The linguistic characteristics of *The Honest Man's Fortune*, then, do not form meaningful patterns of division when combined with other features, and do little to contradict the idea that the play is largely, if not entirely, of single authorship.

The spelling of the proper names neither confirms nor denies this supposition. The most that can be said is that there is no underlying consistency in either folio or manuscript. This need not imply collaboration since consistent spelling is hardly a feature of any Elizabethan dramatist. Initially helpful variants in the spellings of *Montague*, *Amiens*, *Orleans*, *Dubois* and *Veramour* in different acts of both folio and manuscript eventually lead to no real conclusion. The manuscript favours *Montaigne* in Acts I, IV and V and *Montagne* in Acts II and III. *Montaigne* occurs twice in Act III but only where the name has been included in moved and rewritten stage directions. One might assume that Knight, himself preferring *Montaigne*, is following copy in Acts II and III. However, the idea gets no support from the folio. The one occurrence of *Montaigne* in I.2 which appears to endorse the manuscript readings is accompanied by four occurrences of *Montague*, the spelling which is used consistently by the folio in all other scenes, apart from a single *Mountague* in III.3. Up to the end of II.2 the manuscript spells *Amiens* and *Orleans*; after II.2 *Amience* and *Orleance*, a sign which again might indicate a change in copy were it not for

three occurrences of *Orleance* in the folio's I.1 and one each of *Orleance* and *Amience* in II.2. The folio has both *Amiens* and *Amience* in II.3 and III.2 and both *Orleans* and *Orleance* appear side by side in the rest of the play. A similar indifference can be seen in the variant spellings of *Dubois*. In II.2 alone we have in the folio *Dubois*, *Duboyes* and *Duboies*, as well as *Duboyes* elsewhere in Act II. The spelling of the page's name appeared at first to be significant. In the manuscript the only scene with an *e* form is I.3 where it appears as *Veramour*. It is spelt *Viramor*, *Viramour*, or *Viram*. in the rest of Act I, Act III, Act IV and V.4. The name does not appear in Act II. The folio has *Veramer/Vercamer* in Act I, both *Veramour* and *Viramor* in Act III and *Veramour* in Act IV and V. III.1 is interesting in this respect. In the folio text the opening stage direction contains the name *Veramour* and the associated speech headings are given as *Ver*. After the exit of Lamira and Charlotte, Lady Orleans addresses the page twice as *Viramour* and the speech headings appear as *Vir*. It may also be significant that III.1 is the only scene in which the two ladies are given the title 'Madam' in the stage direction. It is interesting to note that there is a change in these habits in III.1 just after the exit of Lamira and Charlotte. This is the only evidence consonant with the notion that there was a change of author at this point. Though the *Viramour/Voramor* variants are suggestive the spelling of the other proper names does not form distinctive enough patterns to discriminate one part of the text from another.

From my review of the evidence for multiple authorship I conclude that the problems have been unnecessarily complicated. Structurally the play shows no sign of hasty composition or of difficulty in fusing separate parts. Linguistic, orthographic and prosodic differences between acts and scenes are insignificant. Apart from one orthographic feature the play could well be the work of a single author.



(i) *Linguistic*

Field's linguistic pattern dominates the play.<sup>21</sup> Most distinctively forms in *-ee* occur in IV.1, V.1 and V.4 (*w'ee*, *Honest Man's Fortune*, p.164; *with you*, Dyce 9, IV/1/38; *D'ee*, *Honest Man's Fortune*, p.168; *doe you*, Dyce 9, V.1.51; *t'ee*, *Honest Man's Fortune*, p.170 and Dyce 9, I.4.40). *Em* occurs alongside *them*, and *ye* with *you*. Only in V.4 does the *ye* form predominate. *Doth* with *hath* occurs in II.2, III.2, III.3 and IV.2 and the forms appear independently in III.1, IV.1, V.1 and V.4. We have three *whilst* in IV.1 and *twixt* in IV.2. *I'th*, *oth*, *a'the* (Dyce 9 only), *ath* (Dyce 9 only) in I.1, II.5, III.1, IV.2, V.1, V.2, V.3, and V.4 are typical of Field. The same is true of *Ha'* in I.1, II.2, II.5, IV.2, V.3 and V.4. There are two occurrences of *on's* in IV.1 and V.4. *Toth* in V.4 may parallel his *byth*. The linguistic pattern which emerges is consonant with Field's. So far, then, I see no reason to suggest, as Hoy does, that Fletcher is present in Act V. It is surprising that he reaches the conclusion he does considering his summary of the evidence.

The play's single instance of the contraction *w'ee*, which we have noted in Field's unaided work, occurs in his IV.1. The fact that the parallel forms *d'ee* and *t'ee* appear respectively in V.1 and V.4 points I think - together with sundry other shreds of evidence - in a direction: namely that Fletcher is not solely responsible for the fifth act. For one thing the occurrence of *ye* is too low; when the form occurs only 16 times in a single scene, as opposed to 65 occurrences of *you* (in V.4), or twice, as opposed to 26 occurrences of *you* (in V.1), we can be fairly sure that we are not dealing with unaided Fletcher. Then one notes the cluster of speeches headed *Omnes*; there are five of these in the play's final scene (V.4). The folio ending of the play, altered in the manuscript...has usually been written off as a typically Fletcherian lapse in taste. I doubt that he is responsible for the scene...judged on purely literary grounds, the scene has a decidedly Fieldian ring.

(Hoy, IV, p.105)

The linguistic patterns of V.2 and V.3 do not have any distinctively Fletcherian features and are consonant with Field's. Indeed the dominance of *you* over *ye* in V.2 is in favour of Field. The contracted forms *oth* (*ath*, Dyce 9) and *ith, on's* and *ha'* could as easily be Field's. The only slight doubt is a single *a* for *he* in V.2 but this is not a constant feature of Fletcher's pattern either (Hoy, I, p.145). It seems unnecessarily complicated to assume Fletcher's presence unless it is required by the play's publication in the 1647 folio. Even so the grounds for attributing any of Act V to Fletcher are weak. The simplest solution is the most plausible: that Field wrote Act V.

Hoy also advocates Massinger's authorship of the opening of III.1 up to the entry of Montague, and he thinks 'that Massinger is present again, to an extent that I would not attempt to determine in III.3' (Hoy, IV, p.105). The literary parallels which he cites are more convincing than the linguistic evidence. The two sections of III.1 which Hoy isolates are not linguistically distinct. The absence of contracted forms in the first part is no more noteworthy than, for example, in IV.1, a scene he assigns confidently to Field. The coincidence of *hath* and *doth* is a feature of both writers. In addition the occurrence of three rhyming couplets mid scene and the movement from verse to prose and back are quite unlike Massinger's usual style. In view of the convincing literary parallels, Hoy may be correct in assigning III.1 (a) to Massinger but the linguistic evidence neither confirms nor denies this. There may be some orthographic evidence to support a break as I indicated in my discussion of the play's names. Stylistically the opening of Act III could be the work of either. There are metaphors that do not read like Field's.



...my back shall not  
Be the base on which your soothing Citizen  
Erects his Summer-houses.

(*Honest Man's Fortune*, p.159; Waller, III.1, p.236)

or

...you, that have made shipwracke  
Of all delight upon this Rock, cal'd marriage,  
Should sing *Encomions* o't.

(*Honest Man's Fortune*, p.159; Waller, III.1, p.236)

but Lamira's account of her contented single state is directly parallel to the  
Wife's in *Amends for Ladies*

Command and liberty now waite upon  
My Virgin state; what would I more; change all,  
And for a husband? no; these freedoms die,  
In which they live with my Virginitie;  
Tis in their choice that's rich to be a wife,  
But not being yoakt to chuse the single life.

(*Honest Man's Fortune*, p.159; Waller, III.1, p.236)

The cumulative syntax, the broken lines and the rhymes do not seem to me typical of Massinger's rhetorical verse. The evidence is no stronger for III.3. Indeed, as my tests indicate, this was written by Field. Though one cannot be entirely conclusive it seems that the linguistic evidence does not demand the attribution of parts of Act III to Massinger. That from style is not so clear cut.

## (ii) *Prosodic*

I have already discussed the play's metrical characteristics in my description of it as a play of single authorship. The use of prose, verse and rhyme in *The Honest Man's Fortune* matches Field's usual practice. All the verse scenes end with a rhyming couplet apart from III.1, V.1 and V.2. II.2 is a long prose scene but the last four lines not metrically accurate are set out as verse and the last two lines are a rhyming couplet. IV.2, II.5, III.2, III.3, IV.1 and IV.2 all move in and out of prose and verse quite freely. Rhymed *sententiae* can be found in IV.1 and exits are marked with rhyme in III.2 and IV.1. Rhymed endings to speeches mid-scene are common in III.1, IV.1 and V.1.

## (iii) *Textual and Accidental*

In a play where the situation is complicated by the existence of two texts, spelling is less than usually reliable but forms like 'thancke', 'drincking', 'twinckling', 'rancke', 'suncke' and 'shrincke' are common in the manuscript and do not seem to be attributable to Knight. There is some evidence that the spellings with '-nck' were in the original copy. At II.3.36 Dyce 9 has 'shruncke' where the folio has 'struck' (*Honest Man's Fortune*, p.157). The folio, from the context, seems an error, most likely as a result of misreading handwriting in which the word was spelt 'shrunck'. One '-nck' spelling occurs in the folio. Where the manuscript has 'sincke' the folio reads 'sinck' (*Honest Man's Fortune*, p.155; Dyce 9, II.2.86). The folio has



other forms with intrusive *c* like 'harck' (*Honest Man's Fortune*, p.161; Dyce 9, 'harke'); 'barck' (*Honest Man's Fortune*, p.155; Dyce 9, 'barck') and 'stricking' (*Honest Man's Fortune*, p.161; Dyce 9, 'strikeing') and these again may suggest Field's preferences. At worst there is nothing in the orthography of either manuscript or folio to make Field's authorship of the play impossible.

Little can be learned from the distribution of non-syntactical brackets in the texts. These are, of course, more than usually subject to scribal or compositorial interference. In the folio bracketed vocatives are rare, occurring in I.1, I.2, III.1, IV.1 and V.4 (pp. 149, 150, 152, 159, p. 165 and 171). Similarly unusual brackets are to be found in I.1, I.2, III.3, IV.1, V.2 and V.4 (pp. 149, 151, 161, 163, 164, 169 and 171). Their use seems to me indifferent.

In a brief appendix to his study on Middleton and Shakespeare, MacDonald Jackson considers the authorship of *The Honest Man's Fortune*.<sup>22</sup> Using orthographic variants for the exclamation, he charts a distinction between what he calls 'o scenes' (I.1-3, IV.2 and 'perhaps' II.4) and 'oh' scenes (III.1, III.3, IV.1, V.4). The exclamation does not occur in other scenes of the play. V.4, interestingly, has the occurrences of *oh*, but in the final lines, where the manuscript and folio have different versions of the end of the play, the folio continues to read *oh* but the manuscript reads *o*. This might suggest that the original ending is that of the folio, as I surmised earlier, and that Knight is copying a variant derived from a change to the end of the play. Yet very little can be made of this. The distribution of *oh* and *o* in both manuscript and folio does not correlate with any other linguistic or orthographic patterns. Jackson acknowledges that it directly contradicts the metrical evidence, which he accepts as reliable. Indifference to *oh/o* is a common feature of many dramatic texts. It is true that *oh* appears in *A Woman is a Weathercock* and *Amends for Ladies* but it seems unwise to place too much reliance on this discriminator. It seems best therefore to

regard the *oh* forms of Acts III, IV and V, as no more indicative of Field's presence than the *o* forms which suggest his absence in Act I.

Both folio and manuscript mark the beginnings of acts but there are no scene divisions. This is Field's usual practice though, of course, almost wholly conventional. Less usual, however, is Field's use of Latin in stage directions. The survival of the Latin conjunction *et* - '*Ext: Maly et Lapoop*' - (Dyce 9, III.3.199) may be indicative. The *omnes* speech heading is, not unexpectedly, a feature of the last scene occurring three times in the manuscript and folio texts, and once more in the folio's variant ending.

The folio's

*Enter Laverdine and Veramour, like a Woman*

(*Honest Man's Fortune*, p.171)

*Enter Orleance...Charlote, like a Bride*

(*Honest Man's Fortune*, p.169)

are closer to Field's usual habit than the manuscript's

*Ent: Laverdine: & Viram: as A woeman:*

(Dyce 9, V.4, 223)

and

*Enter Orleance...Charlott drest as A Bride:*

(Dyce 9, V.4, OSD)

Knight quite clearly edited this final direction - he reorders the entry of characters and adds some Attendants.



iv) *Theatrical*

The folio text has descriptive stage directions which seem to be authorial. In a prompt book, for example

*Enter Montague, alone, in meane habit.*

*(Honest Man's Fortune, p.163)*

one might expect the extraneous 'alone' to be omitted, and, indeed, this is what Knight does in the manuscript which reads

*Enter Montaigne: in meane habit*

*(Dyce 9, IV.1.OSD)*

*Enter Amience in hast, his sword drawne* (*Honest Man's Fortune*, p.156) is similarly edited by Knight.

Another interesting feature of the folio stage directions is the use of short imperatives mid-scene where the manuscript equivalents use the indicative. I think this is also authorial, though imperatives are often taken as indicative of prompt book copy. Field favours these terse instructions to his players.<sup>23</sup> They are common in his unaided work. The folio, then, has *sigh* and, incorporated into the text, *shoot* where the manuscript has *sighes* and *shootes* (*Honest Man's Fortune*, p.159 and p.167; Dyce 9, III.1.92 and IV.2.142). In Field's dramaturgy action frequently replaces words. In this play stage directions progress the narrative

*Whithin a clamor, down with their weapons. Enter Longavile and Dubois, their swords drawn, servants and others between them.*

*(Honest Man's Fortune, p.156)*

V.4 opens with a staged picture which encapsulates the resolutions of the play

*Enter Orleance and his Lady arme in arme, Amiens, Lamira,  
Charlotte, like a Bride, Montague brave, Laverdine, Longavile,  
Dubois, Mallycorn, La-Poope*

*(Honest Man's Fortune, p.169)*

The order of entry suggests their eventual grouping, and Lamira makes the new found amity expressed in 'arm in arm' clear, 'my house is honor'd in this reconcilment'.

Earlier we have a staged fight - fictional not only to the spectators but to the participants.

*Dubois runs upon Montague and struggling yeelds him his  
Sword; the Officers draw, Laverdine and La-poope in the  
scuffling retire, Montague chaseth them off the Stage, himselfe  
wounded.*

*(Honest Man's Fortune, p.159)*

These directions are not written with any cognisance of the play's fictional locality. The men are chased 'off the Stage'. Awareness of performance conditions may explain another discrepancy between folio and manuscript. For the folio's direction 'Enter Lamira behinde the Arras' (*Honest Man's Fortune*, p.162) Knight writes 'Lamyra showes hir selfe at the Arras' (Dyce 9, III.3.92). Where the folio has *Exit Lamira from the Arras* (*Honest Man's Fortune*, p.162), Knight makes the stage action clearer by his *Ent: Lamyra from the Aras* (Dyce 9, III.3.134). The folio in each case seems to me to be written from the point of view of the actor playing Lamira. In the second of the two directions the folio's *Exit*, for an expected *Enter*, gives the specific action of the actor, rather than the overall general effect on the stage picture.



The emphasis in the folio directions is on the task for the actor, not just what but how he must perform:

*Enter Amience in hast, his sword drawne,*

*(Honest Man's Fortune, p.156)*

for example. They are an actor's directions.

*Honest Man's Fortune* shows Field's concern with the clarity of his fiction and the naming of characters. The play begins:

*Amiens.* Morrow my Lord of *Orleance*.

*Orl.* You salute me like a stranger, brother *Orleance* were to me a Title more belonging whom you call the husband of your sister.

*(Honest Man's Fortune, p.149)*

There are many instances of Field's 'here comes' strategy. Later in I.1 we have

*Dub.* Here comes your adversaries brother in law.

*Long.* The lord of *Amiens*.

*(Honest Man's Fortune, p.149)*

Similarly in the following scene there is

*Orl.* Who comes there?

*La.* My brother.

*(Honest Man's Fortune, p.153)*

The actors' entrances are built up.

But here comes one made of another piece  
A man well meriting that free born name  
Of Citizen.

*(Honest Man's Fortune, p.158)*

In IV.1 Charlotte asks 'Who's this alights here?' to cover the entry of Longaville 'with a riding rod' (*Honest Man's Fortune*, p.165). In III.1 there is a further example of a prepared and covered entrance:

*Musick, a Song, at the end of it enter Montague, fainting, his  
Sword drawn.*

*L.Orl.*      What's he *Viramour*?

Structurally the play could easily be Field's. It has a long opening scene in which the chief protagonist remains on stage as friends, enemies, lawyers and creditors come and go. IV.1 is similarly structured. Ensemble scenes are very frequent, whereas duologue is confined, apart from some very brief passages, to I.3, II.1, II.3 and part of IV.1. Montague and Dubois have the most audience contact through soliloquy, though Lady Orleans' swift explanatory aside is also typical of Fieldian dramaturgy.

#### *(v) Literary*

Parallels that appear promising at first - the folk belief that revealing fairy favours will make them vanish, and the idea that there should be 'no jesting with edge tools' (*Honest Man's Fortune*, p.156; II.2.230) - appear also in *A Woman is a Weathercock*, *Amends for Ladies*, *The Fatal Dowry* and



*The Honest Man's Fortune* but they may be dismissed as proverbial. More significantly Amiens discusses the habits of parasites in familiar terms:

you never yet had a meales meat from my Table nor as I  
remember from my Wardrop any cast sute.

(*Honest Man's Fortune*, p.157; II.3.23)

...they slip into my lords cast skins some twice a yeare, and thus  
they live to eat...

(*Fatal Dowry*, II.2.95)

...by undoing Taylors, and then my Lord (like a Snake) casts a  
sute everie quarter which I slip into...

(*Weathercock*, III.1.112)

Wagtail's parodic references to

Beavis in Arundell with Morglay in hand  
Neere to my knight in prowesse doth not stand

(*Weathercock*, IV.3.34)

can be used to gloss Longaville's obscure allusion to

...a kind of men  
That first undid the profit of those trades  
By bringing up the forme of carrying  
There morglachs in their hand

(*Honest Man's Fortune*, p.152)

especially when the compositorial reading is replaced by the manuscript's 'their Morglayes in their hands' (I.1.34). 'Gentlier' (p.163, III.3.170) and 'plainlier' or 'plainelier' (p.165, IV.1.169) are characteristic of him. Oaths and expletives favoured by Field are concentrated in Acts II, III and IV. We have the unusual 'Vdsprecious/spretious' and 'pretious' in II.4 and III.2 (p.159,

II.4.135; III.2.56 only); variants on 'humh/hum/hem/hump' in III.1, III.3 and IV.1 (III.1.34 only; III.3.82 and IV.1.255 only; p.163, III.3.146; p.165), and 'slight/light' in III.2 (p.161, III.2.63).

Field's work is characterised by its bawdy. Subtle's lubricous conversation with the Husband and the chastity test that Montague subjects Lady Orleans to are identically motivated (*Amends*, V.1, *Honest Man's Fortune*, p.154, I.2). The open vulgarity, even obsc<sup>en</sup>urity, of the folio ending in which Laverdine searches Veramour's breeches is the product of the same imagination that encouraged Count Feesimple to fondle his 'bride' - his disguised son. The servants' conversation in the folio's V.3 is as crude as Captain Pouts' account of his wooing, with its emphasis on the Courtier being 'pin-buttock't with leaping Landresses' and the same explicit crudeness can be found in the conversation between Mallicorn, Laverdine and Lapoop about women.

...shee sayes I speake as if I had a pudding in my mouth, and I answered her, if I had it was a white pudding and then I was better arm'd for a woman; for I had a case about me...the third saide I was a bawdy Captaine, and there was all I could get of them.

(*Weathercock*, I.2.93)

*Mal.* Yet women go not by the best parts ever;  
that I have found directly.  
*Lav.* Why should we fear then? they choose men  
As they feed; sometimes they settle  
Upon a white broth'd face, a sweet smooth gallant  
And him they make an end of in a night;  
Sometimes a Goose, sometimes a grosser meat,  
... stock fish in a dish,  
If it be well drest ...  
They'l run mad for a pudding ere they'l starve.

(*Honest Man's Fortune*, p.169, V.2.56)

Such salacities are, of course, not unusual in Jacobean drama and they are



very typical of Field's work. What makes *Honest Man's Fortune* like Field's other plays, and unlike others where such bawdy is common, is that the crudities are set alongside a very different picture of women. His heroines have strength as well as sweetness. Whether discussing the virtues of the married state (*Amends*, I.1; *Honest Man's Fortune*, III.1), defending their chastity (*Amends*, II.2, V.1; *Honest Man's Fortune*, 1.3) or initiating plans to be united with their lovers (*Amends*, I.1; *Honest Man's Fortune*, III.3) Field's roles for women allow excellent opportunities for boy players. It is typical of his work that these contrasting attitudes and modes coexist.

'Why wore you boyes cloathes?'

asks Lady Orleans, and Veramour replies

I took example by 2 or 3. playes, that methought  
Concerned me

(*Honest Man's Fortune*, p.171, V.4)

Veramour needed to look no further than *Amends for Ladies* for his example (*Amends*, II.3). Disguises are the driving mechanism of the plots of *A Woman is a Weathercock*, *Amends for Ladies* and *The Honest Man's Fortune*. The fleshing of Lord Feesimple generates a tavern brawl in *Amends for Ladies*: the scene recurs in *The Honest Man's Fortune*. Montague, like Charalois in *The Fatal Dowry*, distributes his remaining wealth to his servants and waits to hear his fate sealed by a pack of lawyers and creditors (*Fatal Dowry*, II.1; *Honest Man's Fortune*, p.152, I.1). Attachment for debt triggers plots in *The Honest Man's Fortune* as it does in *Amends for Ladies* and *The Fatal Dowry*. It is not just the repetition of stock situations that links these plays but their manipulation. The handling

of the multiple denouements of *The Honest Man's Fortune* is parallel to that of *Amends for Ladies*. In both plays the wife testing plot is happily resolved well before the final scene, and in both cases the resolution of the other plots depends on a single action; Bould's tricking of the Widow into accepting him, or Lamira tricking Montague into accepting her.

*The Honest Man's Fortune* has always been regarded as a complex authorial problem. In an attempt to simplify and redefine that problem I have allowed evidence from linguistic, theatrical and literary tests to override that presented by the conflicting metrical ones. If one disregards the notion of divided authorship, and discounts the chaotic range of possibilities offered by earlier critics a clearer picture emerges. The idea of the play as the product of multiple authorship has little to recommend it but tradition. Linguistic, theatrical and dramaturgical and literary features support my hypothesis that the play is probably of single authorship. Hoy's account - that the play is largely by Field with 'touches' of Massinger and Fletcher - though clearly possible, seems not to pass the test of practicality. If the aim of collaboration is to speed up writing - as surely it was - there seems to be no point in one writer being responsible for ninety-five percent of the text, and for others to make insignificant contributions. Though Hoy argues for shared authorship, and though Fletcher and Massinger may indeed have made some small contributions the case is not strong. There is little to contradict and much to support the idea that *The Honest Man's Fortune* was written by Nathan Field.



## NOTES

1. The manuscript, MS Dyce 9, now in the Victoria and Albert Museum, has been transcribed and edited by Johan Gerritsen (Djakarta and Groningen, 1952) and all references to the manuscript are to this edition. It is discussed by Sir Walter Greg in *Dramatic Documents from the Elizabethan Playhouses*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1931), pp.288-293. The play appears as sig. 5Tir-5x4v of Beaumont and Fletcher, F.1647. All references to the folio text are to this edition. The play is not yet available in Fredson Bowers' edition of the Beaumont and Fletcher' canon.
2. *The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert, Master of the Revels, 1623-1673*, edited by Joseph Quincey Adams (New Haven, 1917), p.30.
3. *Jac. and Car. Stage*, II, 544-46, 547, 611-12.
4. Gerritsen, pp.xlix-liv; W.W.Greg, 'A Question of + or -', *RES*, VI (1930), 300-04.
5. Greg, *Dramatic Documents*, p.288. Gerritsen suggests that the phrase might be a later addition (p.3).
6. The actor list in Beaumont and Fletcher *F1679* gives the names of the principal actors as Nathan Field, Rob. Benfield, Emanuel Read, Joseph Taylor, Will Eglestone and Thomas Basse.
7. V.3 does not appear in the manuscript; the central protagonist is called Montagne in Dyce 9 and Montague in the folio. The parasite is called Laverdure in Dyce 9, Laverdine in the folio. The folio treats the final episode in which Veramour's sex is established with much more freedom than Dyce 9. The folio has no scene divisions. I use Gerritsen's scene headings for convenience.
8. R.B.McKerrow, *Prolegomena for the Oxford Shakespeare, A Study in Editorial Method* (Oxford, 1939), p.15.
9. Gerritsen's argument rests on but a single case since the 'at tennis/in the Tennis Court (III.2.31) and the 'in Prison/a Prisoner' (III.2.68) variations both occur in passages of prose, and the variation between the definite and indefinite article at I.1.339 is metrically insignificant. By contrast, the manuscript's short line at V.4.147 is no more 'correct' than the folio's. We are then left with the 'like Iustice/like a Iudge' variants at V.4.SD where Gerritsen suggests that since the manuscript reading gives a regular line of blank verse it must be correct. But metrical regularity is no certain indication of authorial copy.



10. The folio text has undergone a purging of oaths. In IV.1, for example, both *pox* and *devill* are omitted in the folio text, being replaced by dashes (*Honest Man's Fortune*, IV.1, p.165).
11. Gerritsen appears to miss the dramatic point here.
12. Perhaps the differences reflect their provenance. Similar changes were made in the text of *The Malcontent* when it was taken over by the King's Men from the Queen's Revels company.
13. Gerritsen (p.lxviii) quotes these instances.
14. F.G.Fleay, *A Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama, 1559-1642*, 2 vols. (London, 1891), I, 196; *Eliz. Stage*, III, 227.
15. John Freehafer, 'The contention for *Bussy D'Ambois*, 1622-1641', *Theatre Notebook*, 23 (1968/9), 61-69. See also *Eliz. Stage*, II, p.317.
16. W.W.Greg, 'The Printing of the Beaumont and Fletcher Folio of 1647', *The Library*, 4th series, 11 (1922), 109-115.
17. It is largely for this reason that I have made no use of such tests myself.
18. Fleay, *Biographical Chronicle*, I, 196; Robert Boyle, 'Beaumont, Fletcher and Massinger', *Transactions of the New Shakspeare Society* (1880-6), 589; E.H.C.Oliphant, *The Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher* (New Haven, 1927), pp.383-87.
19. Gerritsen assumes division by acts in his discussion of multiple authorship but the minor variations he detects are between scenes not whole acts.
20. Hoy, IV, p.87. Hoy uses earlier divisions suggested by metrical tests as the bases of his analysis.
21. The linguistic evidence to be derived from folio and manuscript is, to use Hoy's expression, 'all of a piece' and confirms Gerritsen's belief that both versions derive from the same manuscript. The only significant variation between Dyce 9 and the folio is their use of *em* and *them*, particularly in Act II (Hoy, IV, p.101).
22. MacDonald P.Jackson, *Studies in Attribution: Middleton and Shakespeare*, Salzburg Studies in English Literature, Jacobean Drama Studies, 79 (Salzburg, 1979), pp.216-220.
23. In *A Woman is a Weathercock* marginal notes instruct Sir Abraham Write (III.3.23, 26, etc.) while in *Amends for Ladies* actors are ordered to *Kisse her* (II.2.49); *Fight* (IV.2.101) and *Breake off* (III.4.137). *Draw and fight, throw pots and stooles* (III.4.133) is preceded by a direction in



the indicative: *Strikes and they scuffle*. This mixture of imperative and descriptive directions seem to be a feature of Field's texts. It has to be admitted that such variation is usually used to differentiate prompt copy from authorial papers. In view, however, of the four stage directions in the Melbourne manuscript, my assumption that imperative stage directions can be authorial seems to be borne out. See the diplomatic transcript of the foul papers fragment in Antony Hammond and Doreen Delvecchio, 'The Melborne Manuscript and John Webster: A Reproduction and Transcript', *Studies in Bibliography*, 41 (1988), 1-32 (pp.24-28).

## CHAPTER 5: *Four Plays, or Moral Representations, in One*



*Four Plays or Moral Representations in One* is the last work in section eight of the 'Beaumont and Folio' first folio of 1647.<sup>1</sup> It is clear from its bibliographic history that *Four Plays*, like *The Honest Man's Fortune*, was a late discovery added to the volume in course of printing. It was added to its section 'at a time when it had been anticipated that the printing would have been finished'.<sup>2</sup> The omission of *Four Plays* from Moseley's Stationers' Register entry of September 1646, and its inclusion in his entry of 29 June 1660, further suggest that *Four Plays* was not part of the standard King's Men's repertoire which forms the majority of the 1647 volume (Bald, pp.3, 8,10).<sup>3</sup> It has no actor list. It does not occur in either the Cockpit list of 1639 or the 1641 King's Men's prohibition list.<sup>4</sup> We know nothing of its date or provenance before its folio publication, but analogues with other plays added late to the folio indicate, first, that *Four Plays* is a collaborative work in which Fletcher had only a small share and, second, that it originated outside the King's Men's Company.<sup>5</sup>

Attribution problems posed by *Four Plays* are different from others discussed in this section since distinct authorial shares are implicit in the structure of the work. The piece consists of four very different short plays, each with a prologue and a final triumph, the whole prefaced by an Induction and interspersed with commentaries of diminishing length and significance. Though the individual plays may suggest different authorship there can be little doubt that *Four Plays* as it appears in the folio is intended as an integrated entertainment. After a comic prose induction in which Frigoso seizes the opportunity to satirize the spectators, he sets the scene for the whole entertainment.

*Prologues are Hiushers bare before the wise.  
 Why may not then an Huisher Prologize?  
 Here's a fair sight, and were ye oftner seen  
 Thus gather'd here: 'twould please our King and Queen.*

*Vpon my conscience, ye are welcome all  
To Lisbon, and the Court of Portugall...*

(*'Induction'*, pp.25-26)

After the entry of the bridal couple for whose benefit the entertainment has, ostensibly, been prepared Frigoso comments 'The Play begins'. There is then another Prologue.

*Enter a Poet with a garland.*

Poet Prologue. *Low at your sacred feet our poor Muse layes  
Her, and her thunder fearelesse virdant Bayes.  
Four several Triumphs to your Princely eyes  
Of Honour, Love, Death and Time, do rise...*

(*'Induction'*, p.26)

From this point the action is continuous. No individual titles are given to the separate plays though the Triumphs that end each one are given headings. There are no scene divisions. Each play is integrated into the dramatic fiction of a court entertainment. All the concluding Triumphs except that of 'Time' follow a broadly similar pattern; music, a procession with four banners, the glorification of the protagonists and a chariot drawn by two actors or singers carrying a third. The Triumph of 'Love' can be taken as an example.

*Enter Divers Musicians, Then certaine Singers bearing  
Bannerets inscribed, Truth, Loyaltie, Patience, Concord: Next  
Gerrard and Ferdinand with garlands of Roses: then  
Violanta: last a chariot drawn by two Cupids, and a sitting on  
it.  
Flourish*

(*'Love'*, p.39)



'Time' differs significantly from the other three plays since it is an allegorical masque in which the moralising dialogue is the frame for extraordinary visual delights, an antimasque of dancing Indians, music, songs, the separate but simultaneous descents of Jupiter and Mercury. Its stage directions are typical of masques or pageants

*Plutus strikes the rock, and flames flie out.*

('Time', p.47)

or

*Musick. Enter Delight, Pleasure, Craft, Love, Vanitie &c. dancing (and mask'd) towards the Rock, offering service to Anthropos. Mercury from above. Musick heard. One half of a cloud drawn. Singers are discovered: then the other half drawn. Jupiter seen in glory.*

('Time', p.47)

Scenic effect is also crucial to plot and theme in 'Honour'. The moral dilemma which Sophocles and Dorigen face is directly caused by

*Solemn musick.  
A mist ariseth, the rocks remove.*

('Honour', p.30)

Diana descends, remains on stage during 'the Shew of Honour's Triumph' and ascends. The space requirements are considerable. Valerius enters '*like Mercury singing*' ('Honour', p.31).

The provenance of these plays is not known. The closest parallels to the effects I have cited can be found outside the theatre in masques and pageants of the period. Thomas Campion's *The Lord's Masque*, for example, written for performance on 14 February 1612/13 includes

...at the end of their descent the cloud brake in twain, and one part of it (as with a wind) was blown athwart the scene.<sup>6</sup>

In a pageant performed on October 29, 1613, Truth asks

What's here? the mist of Error?

...

Vanish infectious fog...

At this powerful command the mists vanish and give way: the cloud suddenly rises and changes into a bright spreading canopy.<sup>7</sup>

Middleton's *Inner Temple Masque; or, Masque of Heroes* played in January 1618/19 includes a device almost parallel to that in 'Time' - a first cloud vanishing to disclose Harmony and a choir, then the clouds drawn again to discover masquers 'sitting in arches of clouds'.<sup>8</sup> In Middleton's *The Triumph of Love and Antiquity* we have

...The Triumphant Chariot of love with his graceful concomitants, the chariot drawn with two luzerns...<sup>9</sup>

For a New Year's Day masque of 1613/14 Jonson demanded a special property, Cupid's chariot.<sup>10</sup> In *Four Plays* 'The Triumph of Love' ends with just such a chariot.

Other characteristics of the piece also suggest that it was designed for a specific private occasion; its celebratory and gracious acknowledgement of the royal bridal pair in its framing fiction, its attentiveness to its spectators on the 'scaffold' and its overtly moral lessons.<sup>11</sup>

These indications may, however, be misleading. The court entertainment is the context for the dramatic fiction, just as it is in *The*



*Maid's Tragedy* and in other theatre pieces of the period. The dependence of *Four Plays* on dance, spectacle and song, and its scenic demands do not necessarily imply private or occasional performance. It is consonant, for example, with other plays performed by the Queen's Revels boys at Blackfriars. Masques were frequent in their repertoire. They staged thirteen masques or masque-like episodes in eleven plays during their time there.<sup>12</sup> By 1612 Ben Jonson was complaining that 'jigges and dances' were 'the only part of Art that tickles the spectators', and Nathan Field makes a similar point in his prefatory verses to *Catiline*.<sup>13</sup> The private theatres were equipped with the necessary machinery.

That three of the plays of this entertainment are really theatre pieces is also suggested by their content. Only the last - 'Time' - is allegorical. 'Honour' has a bawdy comic subplot conducted in lively prose. 'Love' is an entirely conventional, though condensed, tragi-comedy. 'Death' is a typical revenge piece.

We do not know where or by whom the pieces were performed, but there is one hint. The Poet's Prologue to *Four Plays* implies performance by a children's company with its reference to their presentation by 'Apes and Zanies'. Roderic Pringle<sup>d</sup> has shown how these terms are appropriated to the 'children' and their performances.<sup>14</sup> A performance of *Four Plays* would be best served by a company that included adults supplemented by more children, singers and dancers than usual. Such a company existed for a brief period in the combined Lady Elizabeth's and Children of the Revels companies after March 1612/13, the same company who performed *Bartholomew Fair* and whose chief actor was Nathan Field (*Eliz. Stage*, III, 372-3).

The plausibility of this proposal cannot be tested against knowledge of the date of *Four Plays* since we know nothing about when they were written.

We can gain no help from a consideration of sources, since the works of Boccaccio, Bandello, and Lucian on which the plays are based were available throughout the Elizabethan period.<sup>15</sup>

But performances in 1613-14 by the combined company led by Field is not impossible if Lawrence is correct in his suggestion that the 'Virginian colony' of 'Time' is a response to a topical interest in all things Indian after the capture of the Indian princess Pacohontas in 1612 and the subsequent negotiations for her release.<sup>16</sup> The date and provenance of *Four Plays* are unclear but it is a tenable hypothesis that they were performed by Field's combined company in or around 1613. Fortunately the internal evidence is strongly in favour of this.

It is difficult to determine the nature of the copy underlying the only substantive text of *Four Plays in One*, that in the Beaumont and Fletcher folio of 1647. R.C.Bald, working on the assumption that the calls for flourishes and music, and directions for lights and props necessarily mean prompt copy, compares the text with *The Double Marriage* where author and 'stage adaptor' can be seen working together in the stage directions (Bald, pp.30-40, p.108). I do not find any evidence that indicates clearly the nature of the copy text. If it is, as Bald surmises, prompt copy I would not expect there to be omitted entrances and exits, or a lack of specific direction for vital action. There is no exit, for example, marked for Dorigen's ladies where one is clearly demanded by the dialogue.

Mar. Dismiss your women, pray,  
And I'll reveal my grief.

Dor. Leave me.

('Honour', p.29)

Again there is no exit marked for Dorothea who is told quite clearly '*Doll*, go you instantly, and finde out *Gerrard*', which she obviously does ('Love',



p.36). There are no directions about the handling of the cup or the 'deaths' at the end of 'Love', or for handling the weapon with which Dorigen threatens suicide ('Love', p.37; 'Honour', p.31). By contrast, many of the stage directions, especially for the conduct of the dumbshows are very full indeed. I have made the assumption that these, as well as those for the Triumphs that end each piece, are authorial since they are so integral to the conduct and meaning of their plays. Fortunately, if Hoy is right in his belief that 'the manuscript behind the folio text was the work of the scribe Ralph Crane', then much of the original material is retrievable in any case. Crane's care in 'preserving the linguistic forms of his authors' is noteworthy.<sup>17</sup>

Observing the distinct metrical, linguistic and stylistic differences between the 'Induction', 'Honour' and 'Love' on one hand, and 'Death' and 'Time' on the other, all critics, who have studied *Four Plays* are unanimous that two authors must be involved and I see no reason to dissent from this. All are equally unanimous that the author of 'Death' and of 'Time' is John Fletcher. The identity of his collaborator has been the subject of greater controversy, but I am convinced that it is Field, not Beaumont, who is responsible for the 'Induction', the intermeans, 'Honour' and 'Love'. This is also the view of Hoy whose findings are now generally accepted.<sup>18</sup> My discussion amplifies and supplements his work and deals with non-linguistic characteristics in addition.

#### (i) *Linguistic*

The two contenders for the non-Fletcherian sections of *Four Plays in One* proposed by earlier scholars are Beaumont and Field. The linguistic

differences between these two authors are not sharply defined. The most useful features for distinguishing Beaumont's work from Field's are Beaumont's very sparing use of *ye*, a form popular with Field, his use of the unusual *'am* (for *'em*), but a preference for *them* against Field's use of *'em*, and a very regular use of *a* (for *he*), a form that Field avoids. Beaumont does not employ Field's favoured forms in *'ee*, like *d'ee*, *t'ee* and so on. Beaumont likes *between*, Field *betwixt* or *twixt*.<sup>19</sup>

Hoy regards 'the linguistic pattern that emerges from the framework and from the first two plays as Field's and not Beaumont's' (Hoy, IV, p.95) and other evidence confirms this. Though Field's marker *d'ee* does not occur, the three occurrences of *d'ye* and one of *wi'you* (regarded by Hoy as expansions of Field's contractions) are in 'Honour' (p.29), 'Love' (p. 33 and p.35) and 'Honour' (p.29). *Twixt* occurs in 'Honour' (p.31) and 'Love' (pp. 35 and 37). The preferred form <sup>in</sup><sub>^</sub> 'Honour' is *whilest*, not Beaumont's *while* ('Honour', p.28). *Ye* is used very regularly alongside *you* in these sections of *Four Plays*. There are no occurrences of Beaumont's *a* for *he*. Field's *'s* for *his* appears as *on's* in 'Love' (p.36). *'Em* and the concurrence of *hath* and *doth*, distinguishing Fieldian features, are frequent. The linguistic patterns are consonant with Field's. Linguistic features that distinguish Field from Beaumont occur in sufficient frequency to suggest that the Induction and intermean and the first two plays were written by Field, not Beaumont.

## (ii) Prosodic

The Induction and intermeans, and 'Honour' and 'Love' all show themselves as Field's in the ways that they use prose, blank verse and rhyme. Rhyme is frequent. Each of the verse scenes of these sections ends in a



rhyming couplet. The Induction includes verse, prose and rhymed couplets. The brief intermeans combine prose and verse in a fluid way as the dialogue moves between the prose speakers Frigoso and Rinaldo and the verse and rhyme speakers, the King and Queen of Portugal. The first intermean ends on an extended *sententia* expressed in rhyme.

...Sweet Poetry's  
a flower, when men like Bees and Spiders, may  
bear poison, or else sweets and Wax away.  
Be venom-drawing Spiders they that will;  
I'll be the Bee, and suck the honey still.

('Intermean', I, p.32)

Variations like these within a very short scene are typical of Field. With Field's work it is often difficult to determine whether a speech should be set out as verse or prose. The second scene of 'Love' is a good example where Gerrard's verse and Dorothea's prose are similar in everything except lineation. In 'Honour' the prose intervention of Nichodemus and Cornelius interrupts verse which is metrically very uncertain ('Honour', I, p.27). The broken rhythm of Ferdinand's explanation of his state of mind shows how Field's metrics break down under the pressure of the speaking voice.

nay, I do dance and sing, and suddenly  
roar like a storm. Strange tricks these, are they not?  
and wherefore all this? shall I tell you? no...

('Love', p.35)

The movement from verse to prose and rhyme within only a short scene is not a reliable test for distinguishing Beaumont's work from Field's, so this account can only suggest Field's presence. It cannot discount Beaumont's.

(iii) *Textual and Accidental*

Certain textual features suggest the presence of Field. Examples of his non-syntactical use of parentheses occur regularly in both 'Honour' and 'Love'. Dorigen greets Martius:

Behold a Princesse (whose declining head  
like to a drooping lily after storms  
bowes to thy feet) and playing here the slave  
to keep her husbands greatnesse unabated;  
all which doth make thy conquest greater.

('Honour', p.27)

The syntactical looseness and cumulative structure of this speech is common throughout both 'Honour' and 'Love'. Brackets are used to mark a shift of focus or delivery.

Sir, I can speak in earnest: Vertuous service  
so meritorious, *Ferdinand*, as yours,  
(yet bashful still, and silent?) should extract  
a fuller price than impudence exact.

('Love', p.33)

Ascanio is the other, name'd *Fernando*  
who by remote means, to my Lord *Benvoglio*  
I got prefer'd; and in poor habits clad,  
(you fled, and th'innovation laid again)  
I wrought my self into Randulpho's service,  
with my eldest boy...

('Love', p.38)

The use of group speech (headed in the folio *All* or *Lords*) is also indicative. Field's use of group speech is unusually high, Beaumont's very low.<sup>20</sup> Both 'Honour' and 'Love' demand frequent group speech.<sup>21</sup>

The misplaced apostrophes in the text might be Field's. In 'Honour'



Cornelius scorns the 'punctilio's and punketto's of honour' and demands 'the hundred drachma's' that he is owed ('Honour', p.28, p.29). Emanuel asks 'what hurt's now in a Play...' (Intermean I, p.32).

There are no Latin stage directions beyond the conventional. Since disguise plays so little part in the plots of either 'Love' or 'Honour' Field's preferred phrasing '*like a*' is present only in 'Honour's' '*Like Mercury singing*' (p.31).

#### (iv) *Theatrical*

Detailed instruction and extended stage directions are extensive, particularly in 'Love' whose dumbshows give very precise guides to stage movements:

*...Angelina brings Gerrard and Violanta to the Frier; he joyns them hand in hand, takes a Ring from Gerrard, puts it on Violanta's finger; blesseth them; Gerrard kisseth her: the Frier takes his leave...*

(*'Love'*, p.35)

Actors are told the manner of their entries

*Enter Violanta at one door, weeping, supported by Cornelia and a Frier...Angelina shewing remorse, takes her up and cheers her...*

(*'Love'*, p.35)

The same is true of a simple entrance

*Enter Ferdinand and Benvoglio, privately after him.*

(*'Love'*, p.36)

Emotions are dictated:

...she delivers it to *Ferd.* who with discontent exit...

('Love', p.36)

*Randolpho* and *Benvoglio* seem fearful

('Love', p.38)

Implicit stage directions make the action clear and in one case offer the opportunity for bawdy at the same time. Watching the bridal pair Frigoso comments

no; how she clips him, like a plant of Ivie,  
*Rin.* I; Could not you be content to be an owl in such an  
ivie-bush, or one of the oaks of the City to be so clipt?

(Induction, p.26)

Small stage business is not as extensive as in the comedies but garlands and swords are offered, blindfolds put on, fights arranged and executed. The silent figure is often as important as the one speaking as, for example, in the long delay that precedes Dorigen's first speech ('Honour', p.27).

The plays and Induction show a concern with naming. Despite the fact that the humour of the Induction depends on the wilful refusal of one character to recognise another, names are given very quickly. Characters are clearly named, either on entry or almost immediately afterwards in 'Honour' and 'Love'. After the opening stage direction of 'Honour' there immediately follows

*Mar.* What means proud *Sophocles*?

*Soph.* To go even with *Martius*  
and not follow him like his Officer:  
I never waited yet on any man.

*Mar.* Why poor *Athenian* Duke, thou art my slave,



My blows have conquered thee.  
*Soph.* Thy slave? proud *Martius*,  
Cato thy countrey-man (whose constancie,  
of all the Romans, I did honour most)  
rip'd himself twice to avoid slavery...

('Honour', pp.25-26)

This is an economical and efficient exposition in which the characters' names are pressed home. In the next ten lines their names are given three more times. As Sophocles' wife enters she is immediately acknowledged by him as 'My Dorigen' and then to reinforce the spectators' understanding the second Captain orders 'Forbear, all but the Ladie his wife' ('Honour', p.27). The information that Sophocles' wife is called Dorigen is then repeated three times in the next nine lines. Names are used constantly throughout the following scenes. In the second phase of the same scene the comic subplot is initiated by similarly clear notes to identify its participants.

*Corn.* Corporall *Nichodemus*, a word with you.  
*Nic.* My worthie Sutler *Cornelius*, it befits not *Nichodemus*  
the Roman Officer to parley with a fellow of thy rank:...

('Honour', p.28)

Virtually all the entries that follow are accompanied by the names of the characters. In 'Love' we have a similar pattern. The play starts forcefully with Violanta's question 'Why does my Gerrard grieve?' and again names are in constant use. Each speech of Violanta's in the first scene uses Gerrard's name at least once. The second scene is similarly economical as Benvoglio's relationship with both Angelina and Ferdinand is rapidly conveyed in five lines.

*Ben.* My *Angelina*, never didst thou yet  
so please me, as in this consent; and yet

thou hast pleas'd me well, I swear, old wench: ha, ah.  
*Ferdinand*, she's thine own; thou'st have her boy,  
ask thy good Ladie else.

('Love', p.33)

Again each character is announced or addressed by name as he enters.

Certain features of the stagecraft of *A Woman is a Weathercock* recur in 'Love'. The discovery scenes at the end of both plays receive little help from the words, relying on movement and stage pictures rather than dialogue for their effect. Dorothea restores the lost prince to his family and Ferdinand and Violanta awake from supposed death.

*Dor.* Rise Prince, go greet thy Father and thy Mother;  
Rise thou t'imbrace thy Husband and thy Brother.  
*Du.Cor.* Son, Daughter.  
*Ferd.* Father, Mother, Brother;  
*Ger.* Wife.

('Love', p.39)

This recalls Strange's revelation of his identity.

*Kate.* Oh my deere *Strange*.  
*World.* My Sonne.  
*Scud., Luci., Bell.* Brother  
*Om.* Yong *Strange*.

(*Weathercock*, V.2.166-69)

At discovering his best friend has intended to marry his mistress, and at the height of their rage, Gerrard and Ferdinand, the heroes of 'Love' are both unnaturally silent. On learning the truth Gerrard says merely 'strange' and Ferdinand replies 'Come, let's kill one another quickly', a clumsy exchange that needs performance to fill it out ('Love', p.34). At the climax of 'Honour' dialogue is reduced to the minimum:



*Soph.* Pardon me, *Dorigen*.

*Mar.* Forgive me, *Sophocles*, and *Dorigen* too, and every one that's good.

(*'Honour'*, pp.31-2)

For such short plays there is a considerable range of dramatic modes: soliloquies and scenes involving more than three people are common. The structuring of a scene by having one character static and others coming and going occurs in *'Love'* and *'Honour'*. Double focus and solo speech are the dramaturgical devices on which the plot complications of *'Love'* turn. The conflict between Ferdinand's promise of secrecy to Gerrard, and his wish to betray him is neatly solved by Benvoglio's overhearing his soliloquy - a playfulness with the convention that seems typical of Field. Dorigen's false admission of adultery is a plot device identical to that of Lady Orleans in *Honest Man's Fortune*, but one cannot base too much on this since it is not absolutely certain that the latter is by Field (*'Honour'*, p.31). The 'testing' of Martius is a variant on a common convention (*'Honour'*, p.30), explained to the spectator by a swift aside, similar to Ferdinand's explanatory aside about the poison (*'Love'*, p.37). Nichodemus's sharing of his deception with the spectators is similarly motivated (*'Honour'*, p.29). As one might expect from an entertainment of this type and structure music has a significant contribution to make. In addition to the flourishes that accompany Emanuel and Isabella (Induction, p.26), Dorigen's procession with *'Ladies bearing a sword'* (*'Honour'*, p.27) and the removal of the rocks demand *'Solemn musick'* (*'Honour'*, p.30), the soldiers enter with *'Drums and Colours'* (*'Honour'*, p.31) and Valerius enters *'like Mercury, singing'* (*'Honour'*, p.31). The Triumph, naturally enough, includes *'a great flourish of Trumpets and Drums within'* Then enter a noise of Trumpets' (*'Honour'*, p.32). *'Love'* is less musical, but *'Soft Musick'* accompanies the funeral procession of

Ferdinand and Violanta, and they are restored to life by Dorothea's call for 'Musick' to 'gently creep into their ears'. ('Love', p.39). The Triumph which follows begins

*Enter Divers Musicians, then certaine Singers...*

and ends with '*Flourish*'.

(v) *Literary*

The *vane* metaphor implicit in the proverbial title of Field's first comedy *A Woman is a Weathercock* is shared by Beaumelle in *The Fatal Dowry* and Martius in 'Honour'

Virtue strengthen me  
Thy presence blows round my affections vane  
You will undo me, if you speak again

(*Fatal Dowry*, II.2.337-8)

...the wilde rage of my blood  
doth Ocean-like oreflow the shallow shore  
of my weak vertue: my desire's a vane  
that the least breath from her turns every way

('Honour', p.29)

The use of the word *vane* is, in itself, uncommon.<sup>22</sup> An unusual collocation of *continent* or *continence* with both *breast* and *burst* links 'Love' and *A Woman is a Weathercock*. When Ferdinand tells Benvoglio



Sir, heaven and you have over-charg'd my brest  
with grace beyond my continence; I shall burst

('Love', p.33)

he echoes Neville's remark to Scudmore

...to conceale it  
Will burst your breast, tis so delicious  
And so much greater than the Continent

(*Weathercock*, I.1.102-4)

in its curious vocabulary. *The Fatal Dowry* and 'Honour' both associate the  
idea of chaos with the unusual word *shuffle*. Sophocles prays

thou that didst order this congested heap  
when it was Chaos, 'twixt thy spacious palms  
forming it to this vast rotunditie:  
dissolve it now: shuffle the elements,  
that no one proper by it self may stand:

('Honour', p.31)

while Charalois tells Romont

...Had I just cause  
Thou knowest I durst pursue such injury  
Through fire, air, water, earth, nay were they all  
Shuffled again to chaos...

(*Fatal Dowry*, III.1.486-9)

More than a verbal parallel is shared by *Amends for Ladies* and 'Love'.

Benvoglio asks Ferdinand

doth *Hymen* wear black?

('Love', p.35)

when his proposed marriage is thwarted. An analogous situation can be  
found in *Amends for Ladies* when the marriage of the ancient Court has to  
be postponed because of the Maid's feigned illness. Bould comments

Hymen comes towards us in a mourning robe.

(*Amends*, V.2.37)

'Honour' and *A Woman is a Weathercock* use similar strategies at less serious moments. Nichodemus defends himself from Cornelius' charge of seducing Florence:

*Nic.* How long shall patience thus securely shore?  
Is it my fault, if these attractive eyes,  
this budding chin, or rosie-coloured cheek,  
this comely body, and this waxen leg  
have drawne her into a fools paradise?

('Honour', p.28)

His list of amatory attractions parallels Sir Abraham Ninny's parodic account of himself

*Abra.* Yet might she loue me for my louelie eies.  
*Count.* I but perhaps your nose she doth despise.  
*Abra.* Yet might she loue me for my dimpled chin:  
*Pen.* I but she sees your Beard is verie thin.  
*Abra.* Yet might she loue me for my proper Bodie:  
*Stra.* I but she thinks you are an arrant Noddie.

(*Weathercock*, I.2.343-8)<sup>23</sup>

Field's preferences for oaths and expletives differ from Beaumont's (Lake, Table I.1, Band 4a, b and 2a, b).<sup>24</sup> In the Induction, framework and the first two plays we have two occurrences of Field's favourite *pish* ('Induction', p.25; 'Love', p.38) and seven of *humh* ('Induction', p.25, 'Honour', 30, p.31; and 'Love', p.37). Beaumont's *Why*, *Faith*, *Many* and *Troth* are rare.

Field's curious vocabulary also occurs in these sections of the play where words are used in their root sense: *antedate* ('Honour', p.31), *indue* ('Love', p.34), *dispaired* ('Love', p.37) and *participate* ('Honour', p.31).



Field's ironic comment on his own use of Latin finds an example in Ferdinand's prayer for Violanta '*Juno, Lucina for opem*' ('Love', p.35).

In *Amends for Ladies* Proudly and Ingen quarrel violently over a woman and Proudly threatens

...be she lost  
The female hate shall spring betwixt our names,  
Shall never die, while one of either house  
Survives...

(*Amends*, III.2.14)

This curious use of the word *female* to mean 'caused by a woman' recurs in 'Love' when Benvoglio demands that Ferdinand should turn 'thy female tears into revenge' in their mutual unhappiness caused by Violanta ('Love', p.36).

Despite the difficulty of distinguishing their respective linguistic patterns, Cyrus Hoy confidently asserts that the non Fletcherian parts of *Four Plays* should be attributed to Field, not Beaumont. Hoy adds supporting evidence from the grammatical inversions which he finds 'a stylistic mannerism' of Field's, and from the uses of 'proper names, forms of address, and nouns used in the vocative' (Hoy, IV, pp.96-7). My own investigations, based on a range of linguistic and non linguistic characteristics confirm Hoy's findings. Field, not Beaumont, was Fletcher's collaborator on this unusual entertainment.

## NOTES

1. *Four Playes, or Morall Representations in One* occupies 8 D1 - 8F4v of Beaumont and Fletcher, F.1647.
2. Greg, *Bibliography*, III, 1017-18; W.W.Greg, 'The Printing of the Beaumont and Fletcher Folio of 1647', *The Library*, 4th series 11 (1922), 109-115; R.C.Bald, *Bibliographical Studies in the Beaumont and Fletcher Folio of 1647*, Supplement 13 to *The Library* (Oxford, 1938 (1937)), pp.30-34 (p.34).
3. *Jac. and Car. Stage*, III, 310-311.
4. *Jac. and Car. Stage*, I, 65-66, 194; E.K.Chambers, 'Plays of the King's Men in 1641' in *Collections*, Malone Society (Oxford, 1911) I, 4 and 5, pp.364-369.
5. Almost all the other plays in the 1660 Stationers' Register Entry originated with companies other than King's. There is something unusual about the format, provenance or authorship of each of these late additions. *The Nice Valour* (1613), the shortest play in the volume, is almost wholly by Middleton. *Wit at Several Weapons* (1613) is almost certainly by Middleton with only a small contribution from Fletcher. Beaumont's contribution is a two page masque, rather than a play, also 1613, prepared for the Inner Temple and Grays Inn. *The False One* and *The Fair Maid of the Inn* can be confidently assigned to the King's Men by actor list and licence respectively but they seem to have been printed from private transcript not playhouse copies. See David J. Lake, *The Canon of Thomas Middleton's Plays: Internal Evidence for the Major Problems of Authorship* (Cambridge, 1975), pp.192-197; *Jac. and Car. Stage*, III.382; Lake, pp.198-214, *Eliz. Stage*, III,232; E.H.C.Oliphant, *The Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher* (New Haven, 1927), pp.451-7; Hoy, V, pp.89-92; Bald, p.110; *Jac. and Car. Stage*, III, 340-1; III.337.
6. Thomas Campion, 'The Lord's Masque', edited by I.A.Shapiro, in *A Book of Masques in honour of Allardyce Nicoll*, edited by T.J.B.Spencer and S.W.Wells (Cambridge, 1967), pp.95-123 (p.111).
7. 'The Triumphs of Truth' in *The Works of Thomas Middleton*, edited by A.H.Bullen, 8 vols. (London, 1886), VII, 227-262 (pp.297-8).
8. Middleton, edited Bullen, VII, 197-216 (pp.213, 214).
9. Middleton, edited Bullen, VII, 308-32 (p.329).



10. Allardyce Nicoll, *Stuart Masques and the Renaissance Stage* (London, 1937), p.127.
11. 'Scaffold' is the word used for the seating of spectators in a private hall. See Nicoll, p.34.
12. Irwin Smith, *Shakespeare's Blackfriars Playhouse* (New York, 1964), pp.230-1. There were two in *Cynthia's Revels* and *The Malcontent*, one in *The Dutch Courtesan*, *The Fawn*, *The Gentleman Usher*, *May Day*, *Poetaster*, *Sir Giles Goosecap*, *The Tragedy of Charles, Duke of Biron*, *The Widow's Tears* and *Your Five Gallants*, in the period 1600-1608.
13. Ben Jonson, 'To the Reader', *The Alchemist*, edited by F.H.Mares, *The Revels Plays* (Manchester, 1967), p.5; Nathan Field, 'To his worthy beloued Friend Mr Ben Ionson', Ben Jonson, *The Works of Ben Jonson*, edited by C.H.Herford, Percy and Evelyn Simpson, 11 vols (Oxford, 1925-52), XI, p.386.
14. Roderic Prindle has collected an impressive number of references which demonstrates the connections between 'apes and zanies' and the boys' companies. 'Apes and Boys, Men and Monsters: The Aesthetics of Elizabethan Acting', (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, 1977).
15. Antoine le Macon, *Le Decameron de M.Jean Boccace* (Paris, 1614); William Painter, *The Palace of Pleasure* (London, 1565-6).
16. W.J.Lawrence, 'The Date of *Four Plays in One*', *Times Literary Supplement*, 11 December 1919. Cited by Oliphant, pp.378-82, who also discusses Lawrence's withdrawal of the suggestion.
17. See Hoy, IV, p.95 and p.97 and II, p.149. See also, F.P.Wilson, 'Ralph Crane, Scrivener to the King's Players', *The Library*, 7 (1926), 194-215.
18. The third edition of *Annals of English Drama, 975-1700*, revised by Sylvia Stoler Wagonheim (New York and London, 1989) now assigns *Four Plays* to Fletcher and Field. She is presumably following Hoy. Previous editions have attributed 'Honour' and 'Love' to either Field or Beaumont. Earlier scholars claim them for Beaumont.
19. In only one play Beaumont uses *a* for *he* eleven times, while Field does not use it at all in his unaided work. Hoy, I, pp.129-46; Lake Table I.1, Band 2d and Band 4d.
20. Of the dramatists whose habits are analyzed by Lake only Middleton, Dekker and Shakespeare have similar figures to Field's. Field has

twenty two group speeches in *Weathercock*, and seventeen in *Amends*, usually headed *Omnes*. In *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*, a much longer play, Beaumont uses group speech only once (Lake, Table I.1, Band 2g and 4g).

21. 'Induction', p.26; 'Honour', pp.26 28, 31, 38; 'Love', p.39.
22. Shakespeare only uses the word *vane* three times. It is not used at all by, for example, Tourneur or Webster. In the proverbial simile of a fickle woman to a weathercock the word *weathercock* is always preferred. See Morris Palmer Tilley, *A Dictionary of the Proverbs in England in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century* (Ann Arbor, 1950), W.223.
23. Both passages derive from *The Spanish Tragedy*, <sup>II</sup>III.1.9-28 and, perhaps, also from *Poetaster*, III.4.215-222, so the exactness of the parallel may be due more to literary commonplace than shared authorship. Nonetheless the contexts are exactly similar. Field performed in *Poetaster*.
24. MacDonald P. Jackson, *Studies in Attribution: Middleton and Shakespeare*, Salzburg Studies in English Literature, Jacobean Drama Studies, 79 (Salzburg, 1979), Table IX, pp.194-201.



## CHAPTER 6: *The Faithful Friends*

There is no external evidence to connect *The Faithful Friends* with any specific date of composition, playhouse or acting company. The earliest presumed reference to the play is Humphrey Moseley's Stationers' Register entry of 29 June 1660, where the title is given as 'The Faithfull Friend. a Comedy...by ffrancis Beaumont & Iohn ffletcher'.<sup>1</sup> Neither the description nor the attribution of this entry is accurate.<sup>2</sup>

*The Faithful Friends* does not appear in either of the Beaumont and Fletcher folios of 1647 and 1679. There are no seventeenth-century editions of the play.<sup>3</sup> Were it not for the existence of MS Dyce 10 the play, like others associated with it in the 1660 entry, would be lost.<sup>4</sup>

The manuscript consists of forty two leaves in four main hands. The body of the play is written in the hand of the original scribe A.<sup>5</sup> Occasionally, presumably because of difficulties with his copy, he left blanks. Some of these he was later able to fill; others were filled by other hands. The second hand is described by Greg as 'the chief contemporary corrector'.<sup>6</sup> The Malone Society editors assign him *siglum* B. B altered, added to and deleted A's transcript, clearly correcting it and adapting it for performance. Some of the cuts made by B seem to have been motivated by the fear of censorship, others by dramatic requirements. He has added some lines to link up passages where he has proposed cuts.

At the beginning and end of the manuscript one must infer some damage or loss, since an eighteenth century copyist, C, has supplied pages 1 to 3 and page 42.<sup>7</sup> C also made sporadic alterations to A's text, filling in some of his *lacunae*. A fourth hand, R, (Greg's B) wrote the dialogue for IV.5 on a single leaf, which fills out the summary for it given on the previous page. R postdates A and B. His brief dialogue is written on paper whose watermark comes from after 1640.<sup>8</sup> A, B, C and R are all unknown, though there has been some attempt, dismissed by Greg, Pinciss and Proudfoot, to identify R



with Massinger (*Faithful Friends*, p.xi).<sup>9</sup>

The Malone Society editors suggest that the characteristics of the manuscript can be best explained by A and B both working on it. They hypothesise that authorial foul papers were given to A, but that they were incomplete. A, a professional scribe closely associated with the players, produced a hasty copy, leaving gaps where he had difficulties. He may well have had recourse to the 'plotte' of the original play since he included the dumbshow and the descriptive summary of IV.5. The manuscript was, after an unspecified period, passed to B who made appropriate cuts and alterations. A then further corrected and amplified his copy. Later the dialogue required for IV.5 was supplied by R, perhaps copying from another leaf, perhaps creating it himself (*Faithful Friends*, pp.xiv-xv).

It is clear from this account of the manuscript that none of the hands is likely to be Field's and, indeed, none of them is. But his authorship, at least in part, of the foul papers transcribed by A, is not impossible. We can get little guidance from the dating of the handwriting, since this can only provide clues about the preparation of the copy, not the date of composition.<sup>10</sup> The latter is uncertain. Boyle's proposal that the reference to Philip of Spain and his favourite the Duke of Lerma in Act I.1 would only be acceptable, because of its past tense, after 1618, the disgrace of Lerma, or 1621, the death of Philip, has little to recommend it since the tense is dictated as much by grammar as contemporary reference.<sup>11</sup> Fleay's suggestion that I.1 contains allusions to the wedding of James I's favourite, the Earl of Somerset, on 26 December 1613 is plausible but unproven.<sup>12</sup> In response to 'the condition of the MS' and citing the same internal reference as Fleay, Oliphant postulates a 1614 revision of an early Beaumont and Fletcher collaboration of 1604, but he offers no evidence to support the idea.<sup>13</sup> Dieter Mehl, judges on purely literary grounds that the play is an early Fletcher tragicomedy, but assigns it to

the period 1609 to 1626 to allow time for a possible revision. He is sure that it postdates *Philaster*.<sup>14</sup> Difficulties about dating are reflected in the range of dates proposed in the second and third editions of *The Annals*, 1604-1625.<sup>15</sup> Since Field's writing career falls within this period I have included *The Faithful Friends* in the group of plays to which I have applied my tests. Our total ignorance of the play's provenance means that there is nothing either to confirm or deny the hypothesis of Field's part involvement. The play may, or may not, have been written for a private playhouse: the indicators are contradictory.

Uncertainties about the play's date and provenance are compounded by the state of the manuscript. Dyce 10 is clearly a scribal transcript that has been altered and corrected by several hands. This makes its status as a source for my enquiries questionable. Some of the linguistic characteristics, for example, must be attributed to the copyists and correctors. C seems to prefer *you* to *ye* since the occurrence of the latter ceases at the point in V.2 where C begins his stint. The low occurrence of *ye* at the opening of I.1 may also be due to C. B favours forms in *-et* which override even some passages written by A. A curious double form *it tis*, presumably A's, appears throughout. R's IV.5 dialogue includes a spelling not found otherwise in the manuscript, *doeth*. However these forms are readily identifiable, and enough distinctive material remains to be read through the screen of scribal interference.

#### (i) *Linguistic*

The linguistic features which the play presents make it unlikely that Humphrey Moseley's attribution of any part of the play to Beaumont is accurate. *Ye* is frequent; Beaumont virtually never uses this form (Hoy, III,



86; I, 133-36). Beaumont favours *between*; the form in *The Faithful Friends* is *betwixt*. There is only a single occurrence of Beaumont's favourite *a* for *he* in Act V, while *em*, a form not popular with Beaumont, is regularly used, as are contractions with *y'*, also avoided by Beaumont.

By contrast, forms I have identified as typical of Field's work can be found in their greatest concentration in Act IV. This is despite the unusual composition of Act IV. IV.2 is a nine line stage direction for the dumbshow; IV.5 has both 'plotte' and written up scene available. The latter is in hand R and contains forms not found elsewhere in the play. In IV.1 *hath* appears alongside *doth* and *em*, all forms preferred by Field, as are the same scene's *betwixt*, *whilest* and *ye* alongside *you*. Though IV.3 is marked by the unusual *tys* and *hem*, forms not otherwise associated with Field, abbreviated forms like *y'are*, *yaue* [sic], *th'arte*, *th'are* and *th'aue* can be found with *hath* and *ith*. *Tooth* in IV.1 and *to'th* in IV.3 are analogous to Field's *byth*. *Th'aue* recurs in IV.4 with *em*. Act I also includes a number of indicative forms: *ith*, *em*, *twixt*, *ye*, *hath* *toote* in I.1, *ith*, *em*, *twixt* and the uncommon *byth* in I.2 and *ith*, *betwixt*, *ye* and *hath* in I.3. While *ith* does not occur in Acts II, III or V, *othe* appear and *tooth* in III.2, where there are also ten occurrences of *em* alongside *them*. *Hath* does not occur in Act III, nor does *doth*, but 's for *his* appears uniquely in this play in III.2. The presence of *ye* alongside *you* in III.2 could also indicate Field's involvement. III.3 continues the preference for *em* alongside *them*, and *ye* (4) with *you* but otherwise shows little sign of Field's characteristic forms. Field is not responsible, as far as the linguistic evidence goes, for any of Act V. *a* for *he* is not a form he normally uses, and it appears in V.2. Act V has no occurrences of abbreviated forms like *ith* or *oth*, or *hath* and *doth*. There are no uses of *twixt* or *betwixt* or of *whil(e)st*.

The case for II.2 being Field's is stronger than that for II.1, though both

could be. In II.2 *em* (2), *twixt*, *ye*, *hath* and 's for *has* could be Field's. *Betwixt*, *ye*, *hath* and *toot* also suggest his presence in II.1 as does the only use of *a* for *at* in the play. Though the content of II.3 is in Field's usual vein the linguistic evidence is inconclusive: *ye* is significantly more frequent here and occurs with *em*, but there are no other distinctly Fieldian features.

In summary, then, the linguistic evidence supports the hypothesis that Field was responsible for most of Act IV, and Act I, part of Act II and, perhaps, part of Act III. He did not write Act V.

## (ii) *Textual and Accidental*

As one might expect from an acknowledged scribal transcript that has undergone some revision the accidentals of *The Faithful Friends* are not very useful. There are examples of Field's usual practice but they are distributed throughout the play. One might attribute the spellings *sparckles* (IV.3, 2530), *ranck* (III.3, 2032), *vnwrinckled* (IV.1, 2402) and *linckt* (I.1.238) to him, were it not for the presence of *suncke* and *wrinckled* in V.1 (2862, 2883). A clear misreading of *c* for *t* occurs in *The Faithful Friends* where for 'my smug fatt Flauia' we have 'my smug fact Flauia' (III.2, 1869). This confusion is similar to that in Act V of *The Honest Man's Fortune* where one can infer that *mync* in the original text has been reproduced as *mint* in the folio and as *mynt*, corrected to *mince* in the manuscript (*Honest Man's Fortune*, p.168; Dyce 9, V.2.30). Unfortunately neither of these can be definitely attributed to Field since the *c/t* confusion is quite common in secretary hand, but the similarity is worth a comment.



Field's instruction for disguise *like a* in IV.1 *Lelia, like a post boy* (IV.1, 2415), IV.3 *like furies* (IV.3.2562) and the 'plotte' for IV.5 seem to indicate his presence but the forms in scenes I think, on other grounds, are also his are phrased differently: *Enter Tullius in disguise* (IV.1.2270) and *Enter Philadelpha in a mourning habit* (II.2.969). A marked Fieldian characteristic is his use of *omnes*. This is frequent in I.1 and also occurs in III.2, scenes I think for other reasons to be Field's. They are also a feature of Act V, however, a part of the play I do not otherwise attribute to him.

Misplaced apostrophes occur in scenes I take to be Field's: *ther'es* (I.1.181), *lu'e* (I.3.704) *sh'ind* (II.3.1425), *gain'st* (III.1.1600) and *Im'e* (III.1.1609, IV.1.2290, 2359), *pa'rd* (III.2.1840), *'ile* (IV.1.2369) and *obser'ud* (IV.3.2575), but one must set against these *the're*, *the'rs* and *to'ot* in V.1 and V.2.

There are Latin stage directions worded in the same way that Field uses. *Exeunt omnes. manet Tull & Mar.* in I.1, (232), *Exit omnes, manet King & Rufinus* in II.1 (797-8) are examples. A further unusual use of Latin is in *Ambo* as a speech heading, but this occurs only in Act V.

The text as it stands has only two examples of brackets, for vocatives or for emphatic markers, both in Act IV. The King pledges Tullius and orders 'Y'are all engadgd (my lords) this must go round' (IV.3, 2514), and, in the following scene, continuous with IV.3, Philadelpha's expression of horror is similarly bracketted, '...yet (alas) Mans an vntamed Creature'. These may be survivals of Field's customary practice, but cannot be regarded as significant. Little can be learned from the accidentals of *The Faithful Friends* about authorial shares or attribution.

### (iii) *Prosodic*

The distribution of verse, prose and rhyme in *The Faithful Friends* is usefully indicative. Prose, a medium favoured by Field is not common, though I.2 is largely in prose, and III.2 has an extended prose dialogue. I.2 mixes prose and verse in a loosely flowing characteristic way of Field. There are rhymed sequences associated with the foolish knight Sir Pergamus and his mighty dwarf in II.2, III.2 and IV.5, but otherwise the use of rhyme is sparing. There are exit rhymes in III.3 and IV.4, and, of course, the songs are in rhyme. It is difficult to apply the criterion of end of scene rhymes in Act IV since IV.2's dumbshow follows immediately, IV.3 and IV.4 are continuous, and IV.5 is a later addition, but IV.4 ends conventionally on a rhyme. While I.2 ends in a song, both I.1 and I.3 end on rhymes. II.3 also ends on a song but II.1 ends with a rhyme, and the same scene has an instance of a mid scene rhyme at the end of Rufinus' soliloquy. II.2, though a verse scene, does not end on a rhyme. There is no rhyme in Act V apart from the weak half rhyme which ends the play. The scenes of Act III all end in rhyme. The indications from the use of prose and rhyme are that Field could have written Act I, II.1, II.2, most of Act III and Act IV. He is unlikely to have written Act V.

### (iv) *Theatrical*

Of all the acts in *The Faithful Friends* Act IV offers most opportunities for spectacular staging. IV.2 is a brief dumbshow, IV.3 a magnificent banquet scene incorporating a masque and IV.4 is an impressive seduction scene. All



these elements, though obviously not unique to him, can be found in Field's customary dramaturgy. Field's dumbshows are not merely illustrative and the one in IV.2 of *The Faithful Friends* progresses the plot in the same way as those in *Four Plays* and *The Queen of Corinth*.

Enter in a Dumbe shewe: 2. Flamines After them one bearing  
an offering for the Kinge: then 4. Senators, after them Titus  
Martius talking to Rufinus: Learchus & Leontius following,  
Then Philadelpha richly Attird, her Traine borne vpp by Virgins  
all carrying in there hands seuerall kindes of Sacrifice So passe  
ouer the Stage. Exeunt/

(*Faithful Friends*, IV.2, 2475)

The use of the word 'flamines' reminds one of the Field's fondness for technical vocabulary and for ceremonial as evidenced by his share of *The Knight of Malta*.

The carefully choreographed movements of the King's guests are controlled by the dialogue. The careful placing of the players is implicit in the King's opening speech.

Sytt glorious Philadelpha, thers thy Chayre,  
to which thou'lt ad more beautie than the Sunne  
can to his golden Chariott; Reuerend Tullius  
you have byn long a straunger; this approach  
adds to your double Wellcome, there, sitt there  
and you Lucr<sup>us</sup> Marcellanus take yo<sup>r</sup> place  
tis for you, and y<sup>r</sup> fellowe Senators,

(*Faithful Friends*, IV.3, 2492)

Old Tullius replies 'The king is full of sacred curtesies' and the parallel stage direction reads *All sitt downe* but Philadelpha's reluctance is visually demonstrated as she still refuses to sit. The King's next lines urge her

Sitt my deare buteous guest, me thinkes as

wee are placet  
in oposition....

(*Faithful Friends*, IV.3, 2500)

words which are as true metaphorically as they are literally. This kind of visual staging is typical of Field, as is the long stage direction which opens the scene and summarises the action in it. Not until twenty lines later does the king call for drink and his lords 'waite on the king' as they are invited to do so at the start.

The masque is also a device common in Field's work, notably in the resolution of *A Woman is a Weathercock*. Here it has a more sinister purpose and the 'young lords' are dressed 'like furies'. Practical stagecraft dictates the king's orders on their entry and his placing of Philadelphia:

Quickly remoue these Tables; heeres your place  
for all things this night striues to honor you  
more lights and more attendance, sitt my lords  
Reuells aske elbowe roome at all tymes...

(*Faithful Friends*, IV.3, 2555)

Music is an intrinsic part of the scene and is common throughout. A song ends Act I.2, cornets mark the presence of the King in II.1 and the soldiers enter with 'Drum & Cull' in II.3. The drunkards close Act II with a part song. Offstage 'musique' warns of the approach of the masquers in IV.3.

Act IV contains another unusual feature which suggests it may be by Field. IV.3 and IV.4 are continuous but the platform is relocalized by an exit and re-entry. Rufinus ends IV.3 with

Away before then  
lead to the Chamber called Elizium.



We then have

Ex: y. Tull. Phy. & Ruff.  
then a rich Bed is thrust  
out and they enter againe

Young Tullius, with a clumsiness equalled only by Strange's 'Oh these are *Lambeth Fields*' in *A Woman is a Weathercock* (IV.2) says bluntly 'This is the Lodging called Elizium'. This episode combines two technical devices used by Field in *A Woman is a Weathercock*. The change of locale shown by exit and immediate re-entry, and the 'thrusting out' of a substantial piece of furniture can be paralleled in III.2 where we have

*Scudmore passeth one doore, and entereth the other, where  
Bellafront sits in a Chaire vnder a Taffata Canopie*

(*Weathercock*, III.2, 68-70)

In what is now IV.4 of *The Faithful Friends* Philadelpha finds to her dismay 'the Dore lockt vp and bolted' (2640). The use of the rich bed and the locked door echo a scene from *Amends for Ladies* whose denouement depends on their collocation. Locking a stage door is a feature of Field's section of *The Fatal Dowry* and of 'Love' in *Four Plays*.

In the same scene Tullius' concealment behind the arras is another familiar dramatic motif used, for example, by the Husband in *Amends for Ladies* and Lamira in *The Honest Man's Fortune*. What makes this more distinctive is Tullius' sharing his intentions with the spectators in a brief aside just as Lamira does. He is dismissed by Rufinus and replies

I am gone  
but not so farr as mischeife wishes mee  
...Arras thou  
shalt hide my body, but light myne vnderstanding

(*Faithful Friends* IV.4, 2620)

II.2 also uses the overhearing device that Field favours.

Solo speech is not confined to privileged characters. In I.3 the disguised Lelia explains her situation to the spectators in a complex expository scene where her series of asides runs in parallel with the narrative (*Faithful Friends*, I.3, 602-617). In III.2 the spectators are put in a position to answer Philadelpha's question 'Whethers Armanus posted in such hast' by the preceding six lines in which Armanus tells the spectators exactly what he intends to do. Philadelpha's rhetorical reflections upon virgin wifehood also in III.2 are addressed to the spectators.

Solo speech is a feature of IV.1, a scene which parallels in structure the scene in 'Love' when Ferdinand betrays himself to Benvoglio. Armanus' opening soliloquy is immediately followed by Tullius' solo speech as Armanus sleeps. III.2 has a similar double focus when the Dwarf, like the Pages of *Amends for Ladies* and *The Fatal Dowry* earns laughter by his undercutting comments on Sir Pergamus' boasts. Other characters in III.2 are allowed to make direct contact with spectators. Armanus confides his suspicions of Rufinus (1756); Rufinus reveals how much they are deserved. He replies to Armanus' welcome

You are kind sir  
and worthy such a friend, heere and in hell,  
Whither ile quickly send yee

(*Faithful Friends*, III.2.1768)

In II.2 Philadelpha defends herself to the spectators as she explains

This wench is honest only straines this mirth  
to quallifie my sorrowe

(*Faithful Friends*, II.2, 1041)



Entries are carefully prepared for and characters are clearly defined by function and name. In I.3 we have

...heere comes one can resolute yee Enter Armanus  
*Phy:* My Lords best freind, best welcome  
oh, Armanus...

(*Faithful Friends*, I.3, 562)

In II.2 the approach of Sir Pergamus is carefully prepared for in Flavia's description of him 'Wadling vpp and downe the streets'. In a teasingly metatheatrical comment she tells us

...some body knocks if it be hee  
expect to heere a perfect Comedie,

(*Faithful Friends*, II.2, 1039)

Later in the same scene Armanus is named on entry (1117). Marius and Lelia address each other by name within four lines of entry and the names of all the others on stage are repeated. The King greets Philadelpha by name at the opening of IV.3.

The low life comedy of I.2 is strongly reminiscent of the Nichodemus-Cornelius episode of 'Honour' in *Four Plays*. There is the same combination of bawdy Elizabethanism in a pseudo-classical setting. The relationship between Bellario and his companions and the drunken quarrelling in the alehouse recall the fleshing scene from *Amends for Ladies*.

Sir Pergamus is invested with a history in the same way that Lord Feesimple is. Flavia suggests to him that they should 'go play shuttlecock' and he replies

A match iffaith I loue that sport [well] a life  
yet my mother chargd me not to use it  
for feare a putting my arme out a joynt

(*Faithful Friends*, III.2.1124)

This gives the player something to start from. Clearly sporting activities for these foolish gallants are dangerous. Sir Abraham Ninny in *A Woman is a Weathercock* explains how his leg was 'broke indeed, At footeball in the Universitie' (*Weathercock*, I.2.379-80).

(v) *Literary*

Field's syntax is cumulative rather than periodic, reflecting spontaneous thought processes, and stage action. In the first act of the play we have

Now let mee freely fold thee,  
noble Lord, all barrs that stood betwixt vs  
are remoued, great Ma<sup>tis</sup> Frowne, our fathers enmity  
caused by the antipothy of honors stem  
w<sup>ch</sup> yr deserts haue leueld, there sterne hate  
that striued to contradict our plighted faiths  
w<sup>ch</sup> long ere this had linckt a brother,  
I hope is reconciled, good blesse me then,  
to heare of my deare Lelia, is she well  
hath not my discontynuance, and harsh threats  
of both our parents forct her timerous sex  
to shunn my wisht imbraces...

(*Faithful Friends*, I.1, 232)

Tullius' words of comfort to Philadelpha in I.3 have the rhetorical extravagance and looseness of Ingen or Bellafront in *Weathercock*:



Weepe not loue, oh spare those orient pearles  
whose worth out vallews all the world beside  
for euery drop those Christall Spheares let fall  
a crimson floud from there black brest shall run  
that thus diuorce us, prethee dry thy teares  
or I shall trator proue to honord Armes  
discouering a wett eye lid

(*Faithful Friends*, I.3, 656)

Although the imagery here is conventional 'christall' is one of the words listed by Brinkley as being among Field's favourites. Familiar too is the syntactical awkwardness of the placing of the relative clause in line 660. The verse moves, in a way characteristic of Field, from the conventional rhetoric to sharp focus on the utter simplicity of the 'wett eye lid', paralleling Tullius' movement towards his bride. The situation is realised in action.

There are further examples of Field's vocabulary and phrasing throughout Act IV. Tullius tells Armanus 'surcease awhile this explicating joy' sharing Valetta's vocabulary from *The Knight of Malta*. Two phrases 'the antipathy twixt love and friendship' and 'the natural antipathy betwixt my fraile and thy immortal substance' echo 'the antipathy of horrors stem' from I.1 (235) and repeat one of Field's favourite words (Brinkley, p.116; *Four Plays*, 'Love', p.34; *Queen of Corinth*, III.2). Another favoured word is 'practicke', occurring here in II.3 (1385) and I.3 (688).

In I.2 the reference to 'a bullet as bigg as a penny loafe' (*Faithful Friends*, I.2.427) recalls La Poope's story in *The Honest Man's Fortune*, (p.155; Waller, II.2, p.222) of being saved from starvation during a battle by a penny loaf hitting him instead of a bullet.<sup>16</sup>

The sexual humour of II.2 with its jokes about 'doing', 'long tooles', 'yards' and 'prick shafts' is of Field's usual standard and is very similar to Flavia's account of her suitors in III.2 with its indecent puns on 'stones' and

'case'. The treatment of Sir Pergamus with its rhyme and mock heroics accompanied by derivative comments echoes that of Count Frederick and Sir Abraham Ninny in *A Woman is a Weathercock*, while its bawdy salacities are reminiscent of Lord Feesimple and his father in *Amends for Ladies*.

Oaths and expletives are used sparingly in *The Faithful Friends*. Apart from one *troth* in V.1 (2845), all oaths occur in scenes which one could attribute on other grounds to Field, and they are the ones he favours. His favourite *Pish* (I.1, 86), *foote* (I.1, 90, 185) and *sfoote* (I.2, 365, 536) mark Act I. *Faith* and *i'faith* in varying spellings appear in I.2 (386), II.2 (978, 1020, 1125) and II.3 (1478). *Sdeath* occurs in II.1 (937) and *sbloud* in III.1 (1529). Stylistically sections of the play do not contradict the idea of Field's authorship.

Since so much is uncertain about *The Faithful Friends* one cannot press Field's claims too hard. The evidence I have assembled from my study of the play is positive enough for me to reach only very tentative conclusions. The case is strongest for much of Act IV, and he may, perhaps, have contributed to Act I. II.2 reads as if it were his, but though II.1 might be, I have reservations about it. III.2 seems to be his, at least in the episode involving Sir Pergamus. On this shifting ground one's footholds are far from secure.

In her monograph on Field Roberta Brinkley writes 'some expressions here and there...do remind one of Field' (p.142) but she dismisses his claim, finding the metrical evidence 'inconclusive' and 'too weak to be of any value in the attempt to solve the problem of authorship for this execrable play' (p.142). But there are other tests and I feel Brinkley was wrong to dismiss Field so positively. Neither do I agree that the play is 'execrable'. It would play well if one ignored the cuts proposed by B which make nonsense of the plot, and did something about the fifth act. It is largely here that the play



runs into major problems as the character of the King undergoes its entirely unconvincing reversal. Up till then it seems a very workmanlike piece of theatre.

The Malone editors find that the play

reveals a fluent if shallow and derivative professionalism in its author or authors, together with some knowledge of a school boy's classics and of the major English plays of the Jacobean repertoire...

*(Faithful Friends, p.xv)*

If one disregards the pejorative tone of these remarks, as I think one should, they are usefully indicative. The qualities they identify are just the ones one finds in the work of the classically educated actor-playwright, Nathan Field.

Realising that an already weak case will not be strengthened by circular argument, I have nonetheless used in the rest of the thesis examples from these scenes from *The Faithful Friends* alongside those from scenes I can assign to Field with much more confidence. My tentative hypothesis receives a measure of support from the fact that it has been possible to do so with a real sense of their coherence in an overall pattern.

## NOTES

1. In the Stationers' Register entry the noun appears as a singular but it is generally accepted that it refers to this play. Greg, *Bibliography*, I, 68.
2. The play is not a comedy and it is unlikely that it contains any work by Beaumont.
3. It was not published until 1812 in *The Works of Beaumont and Fletcher*, edited by Henry Weber, 14 vols. (Edinburgh, 1812).
4. *The Faithful Friends*, Victoria and Albert Museum, MS Dyce 10. The other plays in the entry were 'A right Woman, a Comedy', also attributed to Beaumont and Fletcher, and 'The History of Madon King of Brittain by ff: Beaumont'.
5. The manuscript was fully described by Greg in his *Dramatic Documents from the Elizabethan Playhouses*, 2 vols (Oxford, 1931), II.324-29, and edited by G.M.Pinciss and G.R.Proudfoot for the Malone Society in 1970 (1975). Greg and the Malone editors give different *sigla* for the four hands. I follow Pinciss and Proudfoot but I am indebted to both Greg and the Malone editors in this account.
6. Greg gives this hand no *siglum* but reserves B for the hand nominated by Pinciss and Proudfoot R.
7. Both Greg and Pinciss and Proudfoot use C for this eighteenth century hand.
8. R may be transcribing or actually creating the scene. See also *Faithful Friends*, pp.vi and xi-xii.
9. The resemblance between R and the hand of Massinger was advocated by S.A.Tannenbaum, '*The Booke of Sir Thomas Moore*': a Bibliotic Study (New York, 1927), pp.67-8, but refuted by W.W.Greg in his review of this book in *The Library*, 9 (1928), 202-11. It is difficult to see how Massinger could be responsible for writing on paper which postdates 1640. He died on 18 March 1639/40.
10. Peter Croft and R.E.Alton 'privately communicated' their views to the Malone editors that R, A and B are all hands of the 1630s (*Faithful Friends*, p.xi). This is later than Greg's proposal: 'At first sight it might be thought to belong to the later seventeenth century, but examination reveals a number of earlier characteristics which suggest that it may even be as early as the middle of the first half' (Greg, *Dramatic Documents*, II, 325).



11. Robert Boyle, 'Beaumont, Fletcher and Massinger', *Transactions of the New Shakspeare Society* (1880-6), 579-628 (p.591).
12. F.G.Fleay, 'Annals of the Career of Nathaniel Field', *Englische Studien*, 13 (1889), 28-36 (p.32).
13. E.H.Oliphant, 'The Works of Beaumont and Fletcher', *Englische Studien*, 15 (1891), 321-360.
14. Dieter Mehl, 'Beaumont und Fletcher's *The Faithful Friends*', *Anglia*, 80 (1962), 417-24. I am indebted to Mark Nash-Williams for his translation of this article.
15. Alfred Harbage, *Annals of English Drama, 975-1700*, revised by S.Schoenbaum (London, 1964), third edition revised by Sylvia Stoler Wagonheim (New York and London, 1989).
16. I had thought this might be a proverbial expression but there is nothing recorded in Tilley. Morris Palmer Tilley, *A Dictionary of the Proverbs in England in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century* (Ann Arbor, 1950).

## CHAPTER 7: *The Queen of Corinth*



The first extant reference to *The Queen of Corinth* is its appearance on a list of plays in the King's Men's repertoire 'protected' by a legal document of 7 August 1641.<sup>1</sup> On this occasion no author is mentioned but in the Stationers' Register entry of [4] September 1646 it is one of the thirty or so plays described as 'by mr Beaumont & mr fflesher',<sup>2</sup> and it duly appears as the twenty-seventh play in the 1647 folio published under their names by Humphrey Moseley.<sup>3</sup> The play is reprinted in the augmented second 'Beaumont and Fletcher' folio, where it is accompanied by a list which includes among its eight actors 'Nathan Feild' and 'Richard Burbadge'.<sup>4</sup>

The presence of both Field and Burbage on its actor list, and its known provenance as a King's Men's play, allow *The Queen of Corinth* to be dated between 1616 when Field joined the King's Men, and 1619 when Burbage died. A date early in the period is suggested by two pieces of internal evidence: a present tense allusion to Thomas Coryat who died in December 1617 and a reference to yellow ruffs whose topicality would be at its height in the winter of 1615/16.<sup>5</sup> An examination of the sources of *The Queen of Corinth* offers no real help with a more precise dating since, so far as we know, virtually all the possible source materials were available long before 1616. Only one of the possible sources of the play is contemporaneous with the play's probable date of composition. 'La Fuerza de la Sangre', one of Cervantes' *Novelas Exemplares*, may have suggested some of the details of the kidnap plot and the device by which the villain might be discovered. Published in Madrid in 1613, it did not appear in English until 1640, but a French translation was published in Paris in 1615.<sup>6</sup> Bertha Hensman sees the extant text of *The Queen of Corinth* as a post 1624 revision because, among other reasons, she claims that the comic posturing of the gallant is derived from a passage in Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy* which was not included until the 1624 edition.<sup>7</sup> Though there are similarities in the passages she



cites, and indeed in the treatment of Agenor's love melancholy as well, it is difficult to be certain that these are owed to Burton. The comic suitor has a long history in dramatic convention. He is, for example, an important character in Field's *A Woman is a Weathercock* (1609-11). It is certainly not necessary, at least on this account, to think of *The Queen of Corinth* as a post 1624 revision. The play's date, sources and provenance are not incompatible with the idea of Field's part authorship.

The status of the one substantive text for *The Queen of Corinth*, the 1647 folio edition, is not immediately clear. R.C.Bald includes the play in a group in which

the evidence is by no means...extensive but it is sufficient to justify their conjectural inclusion among the prompt copies.<sup>8</sup>

He bases this assumption on the fact that the stage directions include three references to lights as well as the 'possibly significant' *Enter Drawers with Quissions* and *Enter Vintner with Wine* in II.4.<sup>9</sup> Such directions are, however, not confined to prompt copy and there are certain other features of the extant text which argue against it. Essential entrances and exits are omitted, corruptions in the text are allowed to remain, confusions of staging and of personnel are not clarified. Important properties like the 'cabinet of jewels' or stage effects, like Merione's black hung room lit only by tapers, are referred to in the text but not specified in any directions.<sup>10</sup> The text is often vague about numbers of Ladies, Gentlemen or Attendants.<sup>11</sup> Stage action crucial to plot development, like the giving of 'the fatal ring' and Merione's subsequent faint in III.2 or Conon's wounding in IV.3, is left undirected. There are no anticipatory marginal notes of properties to be prepared or actors to be cued. No actors' names are given in the text. Hensman suggests that the Fletcher-Field original underlying the Massinger revision she postulates



may have been prompt copy (Hensman, p.220). Even granted the revision this seems to me unlikely. There are several significant discrepancies in the extant text which would have been eliminated by a dependable and competent book-keeper. The most important of these concerns the foolish traveller and his companions, butt of much of the play's satirical comedy. In I.3 Neanthes points out an approaching figure to Sosicles and Eraton.

Sos. Who is't Neanthes?  
 Nea. Lamprias, the Usurers sonne.  
 Era. Lamprias? the youth  
 Of six and fifty?  
 Sos. That was sent to travell  
 By rich Beliza, till he came to age,  
 And was fit for a wife?  
 Nea. The very same...

(*The Queen of Corinth*, I.3, p.4)

Clearly the name of the approaching traveller is *Lamprias*. Yet the stage direction which follows immediately is

*Enter Onos, Vnckle and Tutor*

In II.4 we have an almost identical stage direction, *Enter Onos, his Unckle and Tutor* and the character is addressed as 'Monsieur Onos' and 'Onos'. In this scene it is the uncle who is called Lampree. The traveller is again *Onos*, early in III.1 where the direction reads *Enter Onos, Uncle, Tutor, Neanthes, Sosicles, Eraton*, but by the end of the scene he is being referred to as *Lamprias*.<sup>12</sup> *Enter Crates, Unckle, Tutor, and Onos* occurs again in IV.1, while in V.3 we have a similar discrepancy to that of III.1. The stage direction is *Enter Onos Unckle and Tutor*, and the speech heading, as for the rest of the play, are *Onos*, *Ono.* or *On.* But, following a speech heading which reads quite clearly *On.* we have the lines

Then Corinth, thus the bashful Lamprias  
Takes leave of thee...

*The Queen of Corinth*, V.3, p.21)

Dialogue that places the name *Lamprias* within framing directions, and yet has speech headings specifying *Onos*, cannot be explained away by authorial carelessness as the Zanthia/Abdella or Annabella/Lamira confusions of *The Knight of Malta* and *The Honest Man's Fortune* can. It is certainly not characteristic of prompt copy. There is no possibility that the names refer to two different roles. The character is dramatically consistent (*The Queen of Corinth*, III.1, p.11; I.3, p.4; II.4, p.10). To summarise then: all stage directions and speech headings, and the text of II.4 give the gallant's name as *Onos*; the text of I.3, III.1 and V.3 use *Lamprias*. *Lampree* is used of the uncle, not the nephew in II.4. In IV.1, the long comic scene involving him, he is not addressed by name.

The confusion over the name of this character is best explained by the involvement of more than one author, one responsible for using *Onos* in the text of II.4, the other responsible for using *Lamprias* in the text of I.3, III.1 and V.3. Someone, aware of the need for 'correcting' *Lamprias* to *Onos* has tidied up these mechanical matters by regularising all stage directions and speech headings but has failed to notice some relict uses of the alternative within the text. This could have been a hurried book-keeper skimming through the text before rehearsal and changing all speech prefixes, but surely any competent agent would sort out the name of a principal character. It is not really reasonable to allow the 'here comes *Lamprias*/Enter *Onos* confusion of I.3 to stand, or to retain a speech heading *Onos* for a speech so obviously made by *Lamprias*. The evidence suggests that we are dealing with a text which is the work of more than one author, that is probably not



prompt copy.

The extant text is corrupt. Act One provides a useful example. Merione is told that she has to marry Agenor, and her friend Beliza tells her of his reputation.

*Rel [sic]* Indeed fame gives him out for excellent;  
And friend I doubt not but when you shall see him  
He'l so appeare to you. Art sure 'tis he?

*(The Queen of Corinth, I.2, p.2)*

The last few words of this speech are addressed not to Merione but to a servant who must have come to tell her of Euphanes' arrival. There is no entry instruction for the servant, and no dialogue to convey the information. Merione replies to Beliza only after the servant's exit. Shortly afterwards Beliza remains while Merione prepares to go. It is clear from the dialogue that Merione has no knowledge of Euphanes' arrival. Her exit crosses with Euphanes' entry yet neither acknowledges the other's presence, and there is no dialogue to cover the movement on or off the stage. If the errors are not compositorial, and one argument could be that there are simple omissions here, then the mismatch of these two incidents suggests incomplete collaboration and an early stage of composition.

Confusion over the scene divisions at the end of Act I may also be caused by changes of author. Although at appropriate places in the extant text, earlier in Act I, scene divisions have been carefully observed, no new scene is indicated after the exit of the royal party, in spite of the fact that the stage is quite clearly left empty and the space is relocalized. The stage direction following *Exeunt* is *Enter Crates, Neanthes, Eraton, Sosicles disguiz'd* and Theanor is not present. One of the soldiers asks 'Where is the Prince' and is told 'He does expect us at the place I shew'd you'. The stage is

localized in the first line of the new episode 'She must pass through the Cloyster'. The absence of stage directions in this scene of sinister brevity is noteworthy, as is the carelessness of its relationship to the preceding scene. The omission of a necessary scene heading has compounded a difficulty intrinsic to incompletely integrated work.<sup>13</sup>

Another difficulty, this time in Act Two, would also be best explained by a change of author. It concerns the treatment of Agenor. In Act I he is established as a royal prince of great nobility: 'Fame gives him out for excellent' and he carries 'a name above all Princes that Greece is proud of' (*Queen of Corinth*, I.2, p.2). At the opening of II.2 he arrives with due ceremony and, handling the court rhetoric as well as he has in I.3, welcomes his wedding day in language fitting his nobility:

Now, Gentlemen, the time's come now t'enjoy  
That fruitful happinesse my heart has long'd for.

(*The Queen of Corinth*, II.2, p.6)

It comes as some surprise, therefore, when Agenor concludes with 'How sits my cloaths?' As the scene progresses it becomes clear that Agenor is accompanied by a tailor and a barber, despite the opening stage direction which reads *Enter Agenor and Gentlemen with Torches*.<sup>14</sup> Agenor asks peevishly

Do's my haire stand well, Lord how ill favourdly  
You have drest me today? how baldly? why this Cloke?

and the second gentleman replies

2 *Gent.* Why 'tis the richest Sir.  
Ag. And here ye have put me on  
A paire of Breeches look like a paire of Bagpipes.  
1 *Gent.* Believe Sir, they shew bravely.



Ag. Why these Stockings?  
 2 Gent. Your Legg appeares –  
 Ag. Peuh I would have had 'em peach collour,  
 All young and new about me: and this Scarfe here  
 A goodly thing: you have trickt me like a Puppet.

*(The Queen of Corinth, II.2, p.6)*

In a long passage of asides the two 'gentlemen' - the 'taylor' and the 'barber' - discuss the difficulties of pleasing a man in love. The scene is completely self contained, independent of its context. In the following scene Crates assists Theanor in bringing the ravished Merione to her brother's door and their exit is immediately followed by another entry for Agenor. The direction here is a virtual repetition of his entry in II.2:

*Enter Agenor and Leonides, with two Gent. with Lights*

*(Queen of Corinth, II.3, p.6)*

Agenor greets Leonides and expresses his joy at his forthcoming marriage in his former tones. They then discover Merione. Without the interpolated scene there would have been no convincing stage time for her to have been brought to Leonidas' house, so II.2 has a certain practical function but its inappropriateness and its discrepant placing suggest that II.2 was not written by the same author as the rest of Act II.

While Acts III and IV form a more or less coherent unit Act V, like Acts I and II has its anomalies. In V.2 there is a difficulty aptly summarised by W.E.Lawrence in a private letter to E.<sup>H.</sup>C.Oliphant:

In V.3 [sic] the Queen says 'Persuade me not Euphanes' Euphanes is not the last speaker, and the last speaker has attempted no persuasion.<sup>15</sup>

V.3 is a seemingly irrelevant comic scene involving Onos/Lamprias in a way that delays the final denouement, similar to V.3 of *The Honest Man's Fortune*. References to Onos/Lamprias' quarrel with the page link V.3, not to the rest of Act V, but to an episode in IV.1.

The discrepancies and anomalies of the extant text of *The Queen of Corinth* suggest that it is the work of more than one author. This is confirmed by the linguistic evidence. Hoy finds 'three distinct patterns of language preferences present' (Hoy, IV, p.95). To Hoy's allocation of Acts III and IV to Field, I would add the interpolated comic scene in II.2. I had also considered much more tentatively V.3, and, perhaps, I.3, but in the end decided against them.

#### (i) *Linguistic*

Difficulties over the nature of the copy text for *The Queen of Corinth* make assigning linguistic shares hazardous, and I cannot be as confident as Hoy in his assertion. The paucity of the linguistic evidence is well demonstrated by the fact that of the seventy two lines Hoy gives to the discussion of this play, only twenty one are on linguistic criteria. The rest of his short piece is devoted to diction, 'grammatical inversions' and literary parallels (Hoy, IV, pp.98-100). Fortunately the latter are convincing. The most notable examples of Field's linguistic characteristics appear in IV.1 where there are two occurrences of *wi' ye*, conjecturally compositorial expansions of Field's *w'ee* (Hoy, IV, p.15 and p.16). *Hath* and *doth* are coincident in III.1 and IV.1 and each form also appears in these acts. The only occurrences of *doth*, a regular Field form, are in III.1 and IV.1. Whereas Act I follows *them* (17) to *em* (1), Acts III and IV show a reverse preference (III



*them* 2 and *'em* 5; IV *them* 2 and *'em* 14). II.2 and V.3 have neither form, but there is one *hath* in V.3. The only occurrences of Field's *'s* (for *his*) are in III.1, IV.1 and IV.3. While there are no *ye* usages at all in Acts I or V it is a frequent form in the rest of the play, its incidence being highest in Fletcher's Act II. Of the sixty six forms in Act II only one appears in the anomalous II.2 where it is matched by two occurrences of *you*. This is a frequency much more in line with Acts III and IV which have totals of 4 and 13 respectively. I.3 and V.3 have no instances of *ye*. The contracted forms *ith* and *oth* are absent from Acts I and V, but their presence in the rest of the play cannot distinguish Field's share from Fletcher's since both use them. Their absence in Act III, not noted by Hoy, is, confusingly unlike Field's usual practice. Of other Fieldian forms *ha'* and *byth* do not occur in the text at all, but there is *th'art* in IV.1 (p.15) and *thou'rt* in III.1, which also includes *twixt*. Linguistic forms in II.2, Act III and Act IV are, largely, consonant with Field's. There is nothing which positively denies his presence in these scenes. His authorship of I.3 and V.3 remains unproven.

## (ii) *Prosodic*

The presence of rhyme neatly distinguishes Field scenes from the rest of the play. In Acts I and II there are no rhymes at all, not even at the ends of scenes, apart from one possible weak delayed exit rhyme in II.3.<sup>16</sup> Act V has couplets to end each of its four scenes but no others. By contrast, Act III has end scene rhymes and rhymes to mark an entrance, two proverbial or *sententiae* rhymes and one additional couplet. Though IV.1 does not end on a rhyme they are used several times during the scene, to mark the end of a

phase and to give form to *sententiae*. IV.3 has a clinching exit rhyme before its dumbshow and an end scene rhyme. Only IV.2, a very short scene, has no rhyme in this part of the play. III.1 is also typical of Field's work in using prose and verse loosely in the same scene. There are no other extended passages of prose in the play. The verse in Acts III and IV is not metrically regular and it is often difficult to know whether the layout in the folio is compositorial rather than authorial.

### (iii) *Accidental and Textual*

Of the thirteen spellings in *-nck* in the text, excluding those of *Vnckle* in speech headings and stage directions, over half appear in Acts III and IV, and there are two in V.3. There is a particular concentration in III.1 - *crancks*, *canckers*, *Vnckle* - and IV.1 - *Vnckle*, *sinck*, *flanckes*, *blancket* (*Queen of Corinth*, pp.11,12,13,15,16).

It may be more than coincidence that of the misplaced apostrophes I have detected all three appear in II.1 and IV.1 (*ha's*, *'ile* and *weare's*). Act IV has three of the only four examples of bracketted vocatives in the play. Non syntactical parentheses are extremely frequent in Acts III and IV. There are also examples in II.4 and V.3. Act III (p.39) and IV (p.54) also have the only three speech headings for undifferentiated speech in the play - *All*. The only other occurrence of *All* is in V.4 (p.23).



(iv) *Theatrical*

The stage management of the grouping for III.1 seems to me like Field's work. The dialogue of this petition scene needs fleshing out by stage movement as the actors group themselves round Euphanes.

*Nea.* Haile to *Euphanes*  
*Sos.* Mighty *Euphanes*  
*Era.* The great Prince *Euphanes*  
*Tut.* Key of the Court, and Jewell of the Queene.  
*Vnc.* *Sol* in our Firmament.  
*Onos* Pearl in the States eye.  
*Nea.* Being a black man.  
*Era.* Mistris of the land.  
*Nea.* Our humble, humble, poor Petitions are,  
That we may hold our places.  
*All* May we?  
*Euph.* Yes; be you malicious knaves still: and you fooles.

(*Queen of Corinth*, III.1, p.12)

We scarcely need Conon's explanation:

This is the Princes and your Brothers spight  
...  
Yonder they are

(*The Queen of Corinth*, III.1, p.12)

to appreciate the stage management of the scene with 'knaves' and 'fools' grouped separately.

There are extended directions for a 'dumbshow' in IV.3 (p.18) in which detailed actions are specified. The only other lengthy direction is in V.3 (p.21) where the colour of Merione's and Beliza's costumes are prescribed.

Entrances are built up for the players and characters are named on entry in III.1. Just as we are reminded that 'now Theanor speaks like Prince

Theanor', Onos/Lamprias is brought on to an extended passage of introduction. The next person to enter is Euphanes who is prepared for in a similar way.

*Gent.* Make way there for my Lord Euphanes

*Cra.* Look, Sir, Jove appears,

...

*(The Queen of Corinth, III.1, pp.11-12)*

A few lines later the Queen's entry is similarly prefaced. The techniques of III.2 are equally useful in establishing identities and plot lines. IV.3 introduces Euphanes and Conon with an extensive preamble, and further entries in the same scene follow a similar pattern.<sup>18</sup>

Actions are as important as words in telling the story. IV.3 is as dependent on the spectacle of the unarmed man dismissing his soldiers and confronting the revels as it is on Euphanes's showy rhetoric. In III.2 Merione's plight is registered visually long before Beliza comments on her situation. Merione's pointing at the ring, and her faint are the climax of the scene - she does not speak. Much of the humour of Onos/Lamprias comes from his silent action. He is urged

That leg a little higher! Very well.

Now put your face into the Traveller's posture.

Exceeding good.

*(Queen of Corinth, I.3, p.4)*

Sosicles comments 'See how it moves towards us' as Neathes mocks 'There's a salutation'. The whole episode is built on action rather than words. Only later in the scene does the foolish gallant speak.

Acts III and IV contain the only explanatory asides in the play. The Queen explains her test of Theanor (III.1, p.13), Theanor confides 'This must



not be my way' (III.1.p.13) and the Page tells the spectators 'That's my que to beckon 'em' (IV.3, p.18). The metatheatrical effect is one of only two in the play. The other is in IV.1 when the Tutor comments 'Oh see the power of Love: he speakes in ryme' (IV.1, p.15).

Music, always a feature of Field's dramaturgy, is important in III.2 of *The Queen of Corinth* whose paired songs recall a similar pair in *The Fatal Dowry* (II.1). These songs are specifically intended to control mood. At the opening of III.2 the mood is set by 'A Sad Song' but then Agenor and Beliza request a change of song to cheer Merione

Ag. These heavie Ayres feed sorrow in her Lady,  
And nourish it too strongly...

*Bel.* Some lighter note....

*A lighter Song*<sup>19</sup>

(Queen of Corinth, III.1, p.13)

**(v) *Literary***

Characterisation in Acts III and IV of *The Queen of Corinth* is reminiscent of Field's work. The Queen, a formidable and rather remote character in the rest of the play, is suddenly brought close to us with the same hopes and desires as the Widow in *Amends for Ladies*. The Queen expresses her friendship for Euphanes in a manner reminiscent of the Widow to Bold:

*Queen*

...troth I have wish'd  
A thousand times that I had been a man,  
That I might sit a day with thee alone,  
And talke...

(*The Queen of Corinth*, III.1, p.12)

*Widow*

## ...I swear by Heaven

I would spend all night to sit and talk w'ye

**If I durst trust you.**

(Weathercock, IV.1.130-2)

It is not simply that Theanor's view that 'A Widow is a hungry thing' occurs in both plays. The passage in *The Queen of Corinth* plays off the same set of poignant ironies as that in *Amends for Ladies*. Both ladies are afraid of provoking gossip, and neither of them tells the whole truth. Each conceals from her friend the passion she feels for him. The treatment of the resourceful older woman in both plays rounds out the characterisation in both cases.

It is interesting that a real motive for Crates's actions does not appear until III.1 even though it is initiated earlier in the play. The characters are not fleshed out realistically until these middle acts. The issue of Conon's forfeited estates is introduced here as is Crates's relationship with Onos/Lamprias.

The disappointed lover, the foolish gallant Onos, in IV.1 has much in common with the disconsolate Sir Abraham in *A Woman is a Weathercock*. Similarly spurned, Onos/Lamprias acts in the same way.

Garters fly off: go Hatband, binde the browes

Of some dull Citizen that feares to ake:

## And leg appeare now in simplicity

## Without the trappings of a Courtier:

**Burst Buttons, burst, your Bachelor is worm'd**

...

**Burne eyes out in your sockets, sinck and stink.**

(Queen of Corinth, IV.1, p.15)

Sir Abraham's legs are like a plum tree (*Weathercock*, I.2.371) while Onos



makes 'villainous Crab-tree legs' (*Queen of Corinth*, III.1, p.11). They both boast of their ancestry: Sir Abraham's family are 'gentlemen all' (*Weathercock*, I.2.201) while Onos is 'a Gentleman a both sides' (*Queen of Corinth*, III.1, p.11). Newly dubbed knights who have bought their honours are familiar butts of Field's satire, and the concern with courtly behaviour, so much a source of the comedy in *The Queen of Corinth* echoes the treatment of Lord Feesimple in *Amends for Ladies* and Laverdine in *The Honest Man's Fortune*.

Sosicles's retort to Onos's boast of his ancestry is 'Thou a Gentleman? Thou an Asse' (*Queen of Corinth*, III.1, p.11), a comic remark built on the same principle as the third creditor's remark about Rochfort in Field portion of *The Fatal Dowry*: 'He a statesman! he an asse' (*Fatal Dowry*, II.2.281).

Crates in *The Queen of Corinth* describes the effects of love in an image which associates it with dogs and howling. In *Amends for Ladies* 'howling love' is 'like a dogg shut out at midnight' (*Amends*, I.1.99) while according to Crates 'love will make a Dog howle in rime' (*Queen of Corinth*, IV.1, p.15).

In III.2 and IV.3 of *The Queen of Corinth* the image cluster of gratitude, tributary streams and enriching oceans occurs. It is also present in II.2 of *The Fatal Dowry*.

I came to tender you the man you have made  
And, like a thankful streame to retribute  
All you my Ocean have enrich'd me with.

(*Queen of Corinth*, III.2, p.14)

The literal etymological use of *retribute* may also be indicative. Theanor describes Euphanes's growing influence with the Queen

...like a young pine  
He grows up planted under a fair oak

(*Queen of Corinth*, III.1, p.11)

In the terms in which Romont's relationship with Charalois is described

A hearty oak grewst close to this tall pine.

(*Fatal Dowry*, II.1.119)

When Euphanes tells Conon

Vertues a solid Rock, whereat being aym'd  
The keenest darts of envie, yet unhurt  
Her Marble Heroes stand, built of such Bases  
Whilst they recoyle, and wound the Shooters faces,

(*Queen of Corinth*, III.1, p.12)

or Crates tells Theanor

Mischiefe 'gainst goodnesse aym'd is like a stone  
Unnaturally forc'd up an imminent hill,  
Whose weight falls on our heads and buries us,  
We springe our selves, we sink in our owne bogs

(*Queen of Corinth*, IV.3, p.18)

they are both echoing Seldom's comments in *Amends for Ladies*

And euen as durt throwne hard against a wall  
Rebounds and sparkles in the throwers eies,  
So ill words vtter'd to a vertuous Dame,  
Turne and defile the speaker with red shame.

(*Amends*, II.1.173)

Distinctive vocabulary occurring in this play may be thought to link it with *A Woman is a Weathercock* and *Amends for Ladies*. Scudmore is told that he must 'first exquire the truth' (*Weathercock*, I.1.128) and



Euphanes tells Agenor.

Know this Ring was sent me from the Queene,  
How she came by it, yet is not exquired.

(*Queen of Corinth*, IV.3, p.17)

Field prefers an adverbial comparative in *-ier*, so to the *cleanlier* of *Amends for Ladies* (IV.4.67), the *plainlier* and *safelier* of *A Woman is a Weathercock* and the *gladlier* of *The Fatal Dowry* (II.1.60), one might add both *sweetlier* and *justlier* from *The Queen of Corinth* (III.2, p.14; IV.3, p.18).

The distribution of oaths and expletives in the play is indicative. Of the twelve occurrences all but two (*Odds me* in I.3, and *Odds my passion* in II.4) appear in Acts III and IV. Field's distinctive *Pish* occurs three times (in III.1, p.12, III.2, p.14 and IV.3, p.18). *Peuh*, a form in II.2 (p.6), may be a variant on this. Two instances of *slight* in III.1 (p.11) and IV.1 (p.16) and of *humh* in III.1 (p.12) and *hum* in IV.1 (p.15) may also suggest his presence.

In my earlier discussion of the text I raised the possibility that Field was responsible for the Onos/Lamprias episode in I.3 and for the comic treatment of Agenor in II.2. I suggested that Field might have written V.3. Nothing in my further analysis of the play allows me to confirm or deny these hypotheses with any certainty but the balance of evidence from the tests I have applied is in favour of II.2 and against I.3 and V.3. I am certain that Field was responsible for Acts III and IV.

Frank Fenton, in refuting Sykes's arguments for Field's presence in the two acts, wrote

So lacking in Field characteristics are these parts that a first reading of the disputed acts gave me the impression that Field did not write them, and each reading since has increased that impression.<sup>20</sup>

One characteristic that Fenton identifies as 'non-Fieldian' - the fact that 'much of the verse of Acts III and IV cannot be distinguished from prose' (Fenton, p.96) - is in fact very typical of all of Field's work. Fenton finds no sign in *The Queen of Corinth* of Field's way of using rhyming couplets. As I have indicated they are regular features of Acts III and IV.

Fenton finds no roistering comedy or satire in the play and misses Field's customary attitude to women. I would argue that all these are present in Acts III and IV and that there are further parallels between these and his other work. Fenton finds no trace of Field's dramatic method, or of his Latinate vocabulary. Examples of both have been identified in this chapter.

There are other features of Field's work, however, absent from *The Queen of Corinth*, which would have strengthened Fenton's case had he mentioned them: his good humoured tolerance, his vulgarity, the geniality, lightness and freshness of tone, his easy colloquialisms. His fondness for topical reference and topographical precision make only brief appearances, but that is, perhaps, not surprising in a play of this genre and setting. There is, however, ample evidence to support an attribution to Field of Acts III and IV, and of II.2. I do not feel, however, that his was in any sense a controlling voice, or that he had a major role in planning the overall strategies and attitudes of the play. The characterisation, with the few notable exceptions that I have mentioned, is too under-developed. The discrepancies of the extant text show that the play as it stands is a far from unified or coherent work.



## NOTES

1. *Jac. and Car. Stage*, III, 398.
2. Greg, *Bibliography*, I, 56.
3. Beaumont and Fletcher, *F* 1647, 6Ar-6C4. See W.W.Greg, 'The Printing of the Beaumont and Fletcher Folio of 1647', *The Library*, 4th series 11 (1922), 109-115.
4. Beaumont and Fletcher, *F*. 1679. The other actors were 'Henry Condel, Iohn Underwood, Thomas Polard, John Lowin, Nich. Toolie, Tho. Holcomb'.
5. 'This is the Ulisseean Traveller that sent home his Image riding upon Elephants to the great Magoll' (*Queen of Corinth*, III.1, p.11). In 1616 Thomas Coryat published his *Traveller for the English Wits: Greetings from the Great Mogul*, with a large picture of himself riding on an elephant in its front matter. Coryat died in India in December 1617. A similar allusion occurs in *The Fatal Dowry* (II.2.200). The tutor in *The Queen of Corinth* asks 'Has he familiarly Dislik'd your yellow starch...' (*Queen of Corinth*, IV.1, p.15). On 14 November 1615 Mrs Turner, implicit in the Overbury case, was taken to Tyburn. The hangmen on the explicit instructions of the Lord Chief Justice wore yellow ruffs and cuffs in parody of the fashion she had introduced from France. Mrs Turner was a dressmaker famous for dying enormous starched ruffs and sleeves yellow and for keeping her recipe a secret. After her death the fashion died out. See Beatrice White *Cast of Ravens: the Strange Case of Sir Thomas Overbury* (London, 1965), p.125 and William McElwee, *The Murder of Sir Thomas Overbury* (London, 1952), pp.48-9 and p.203.
6. Miguel de Cervantes Savaedra, *Novelas Exemplares* (Madrid, 1613), translated by H. du Bellan as *Les Nouvelles de Cervantes* (Paris, 1615); *Exemplarie novells, Turned into English by Don Diego Puede-Ser* [i.e. J.Mabbe] (London, 1640). Cervantes' stories were popular in England well before English translations were available. Field used the 'Curious Impertinent' story from *Don Quixote* as a source for *Amends for Ladies* before Shelton's translation was published in 1612. See Abraham S.Wolf Rosenbach, '"The Curious Impertinent" in English Dramatic Literature before Shelton's translation of *Don Quixote*', *Modern Language Notes* 17 (1902), 357-67 (p.363). *Don Quixote* was available in French translation from 1608. See also Herbert F.Schwarz, 'One of the sources of *The Queen of Corinth*', *Modern Language Notes*, 24 (1909), 76-77; E.M.Waith, 'The sources of *The Double Marriage* by Fletcher and Massinger', *Modern Language Notes*, 64 (1949), 505-10.



7. Bertha Hensman, *The Shares of Fletcher, Field and Massinger in Twelve Plays of the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon*, Jacobean Drama Studies, 6, 2 vols. (Salzburg, 1974), p.216. Giving a further example of plot discrepancy in *The Queen of Corinth* to support her hypothesis of revision, Hensman cites a reference in Act IV.1 to a boy prince, heir to the throne of Corinth, whom the evil counsellor Gonzalo proposes murdering in order to secure the succession for Erotia. Hensman points out that this boy prince appears nowhere in the play and is not even referred to at the end when Erotia is acclaimed Queen of Corinth (Hensman, p.200). This is scarcely surprising since neither Erotia nor Gonzalo are among the *dramatis personae* of *The Queen of Corinth*. The scenes Hensman describes do not occur in *The Queen of Corinth*. Erotia and Gonzalo discuss the boy prince, and Erotia becomes queen, in *The Laws of Candy*. Hensman is also fallible on the events of *The Queen of Corinth*. She describes its denouement thus. 'Finally Euphanes outwits and overcomes in combat the noble ones among his opposers and so wins the Queen as his bride' (Hensman, p.207). This is inaccurate. Euphanes persuades the rebels not to fight and the Queen marries Agenor.
8. R.C.Bald, *Bibliographical Studies in the Beaumont and Fletcher Folio of 1647*, Supplement No. 13 to *The Library* (Oxford, 1937 (1938)), p.108.
9. *Queen of Corinth*, II.3, II.2, II.4. All references to the play in this chapter are to Beaumont and Fletcher, *F 1647* and follow its scene divisions and page numbers.
10. For example, there is no exit for Agenor and Leonidas in III.2 and no entrance for the soldiers in IV.3. There is a missing passage involving a message from a servant in I.2. The end of Act I is unclear. It is not obvious whether the boys who speak in II.4 are also the drawers. See also III.2, pp.13-14.
11. As, for example, II.3, p.7; III.1, p.12; V.2, p.20.
12. There seem to be no semantic connections to help adjudicate between the names. The parasitic uncle would, perhaps, be called, appropriately *Lampree* or *Lamprias* as in II.4, sharing that name with a jawless parasitic fish, while *Onos* with its echo of a Latin burden would better be the name of the nephew but there is little to go on here.
13. Scene divisions, in addition to the more usual act divisions are found consistently throughout all the plays in section six but are unusual elsewhere in the folio. It is probable that they were the responsibility of the printing house.
14. The tailor and the barber and dressing scenes like this occur in *Weathercock* I.2 and *Fatal Dowry* IV.1.



15. E.H.C.Oliphant, *The Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher; An Attempt to Determine their Respective Shares and the Share of Others* (New Haven, 1927), p.399, note 1.
16. The sequence involves rhyming *me/misery/thee/memory*, but could only include an exit rhyme if a stage direction has been omitted since it occurs three lines before the end of the scene, and the exit marked for Agenor.
17. V.3 belongs with those scenes in which the gallant is called *Lamprias*, i.e. with III.1 and I.3. IV.1 does not name the character but since III.1 and IV.1 are clearly by the same author I assume the author of IV.1 would have called him *Lamprias*.
18. These introductions are not merely expository. By this stage in the play none of the entering characters is new to the spectators.
19. No entry is given for a singer at III.2 but the song is presumably sung by one of Beliza's waiting gentlewomen if the *her* in Agenor's speech is to be relied on.
20. Frank L.Fenton, 'The Authorship of Acts III and IV of *The Queen of Corinth*', *Modern Language Notes*, 42 (1927), 94-96; H.D.Sykes, *Sidelights on Elizabethan Drama* (London, 1924), pp.200-219.

## CHAPTER 8: *The Knight of Malta*



The first extant reference to *The Knight of Malta* is its appearance as '...<sup>h</sup>gt of Malta' on a 1619 list of plays probably intended for court performance.<sup>1</sup> That it was a King's Men's play is shown by its inclusion on that company's list of plays, protected from publication in 1641, by order of the Lord Chamberlain.<sup>2</sup> Five years later 'Knights of Malta' [sic] was one of the plays entered 'For Mr Robinson & Mr Mozeley' in the Stationers' Register on [4] September 1646, when its authorship, like that of other plays intended for the 1647 folio, was firmly attributed to 'mr Beaumont & mr fflesher', and it duly appeared the following year.<sup>3</sup> As the twenty third play in the folio it subsequently appeared in section five, between *The Pilgrim* and *The Womans Prize*. When it was reprinted as the thirty fourth play of the Beaumont and Fletcher second folio it was accompanied by an actor list which included Richard Sharp, Richard Burbage and Nathan Field.<sup>4</sup>

The play cannot be precisely dated. An internal allusion to *The Devil is an Ass* acted by the King's Men in 1616 provides a *terminus a quo* whilst the 1619 Revels Office list confirms the *terminus ad quem* as March 1618/19, the date of Burbage's death.<sup>5</sup> Brock, on the basis of close parallels between *The Knight of Malta* and *The Humorous Lieutenant*, performed in 1619, favours a date later rather than earlier in the period.<sup>6</sup> Hensman supposes a date of composition during the late summer of 1618 when she assumes a performance at court in September 1618 as a compliment to the Spanish and Venetian ambassadors. The play's unflattering portayal of a Frenchman, she argues, would best reflect diplomatic attitudes in the autumn of 1618.<sup>7</sup>

There is nothing in the play's sources listed by Brock and Hensman to deny a date of composition 1616/17-19. All of the books they mention would have been available by these dates, the most recent being George Sandys's *A Relation of a Journey*, published in London in 1615.<sup>8</sup>

The copy text for the only extant version of the play shows many



features of prompt copy. There are frequent indications of the presence of the book-keeper. Most notable are *Discover Tombe* (IV.1, p.88) and *Altar ready Taper & booke* (V.1, p.92) which each occur many lines before they are actually required by the action. Directions are concerned with stage properties such as *The Scaffold set out and the staires* (II.5, p.80) and *A Table out, two stooles* (III.4, p.85). There are anticipatory warnings for actors' entrances like *Oriana ready above* in I.2 (p.73). The play's treatment of properties is also indicative of theatre origin. Entrances which specify properties, like 'with booty' (II.1, p.76), 'with a dark Lanthorn' (III.2, p.89), 'with a cloake, sword and spurres' (V.2, p.93) could be authorial but anticipatory references to the Moor's two letters or her pistol, or to Mountferrat's letter in the opening stage directions to scenes not requiring their production until later probably indicate a book-keeper's reminders. Necessary sound effects are noted. There are appropriate flourishes for Valetta's entrances and exits. Sound cues dictate off stage action - *Drums a far off* and *A low March* (II.4, p.80); *A sea fight within alarum* (III, p.75); and *Low Alarmes* (II.5, p.80). There is occasionally dialogue *Within*.<sup>9</sup> The omission of an entrance direction, in I.2, often a sign of foul papers, is better explained by textual dislocation while a confusion over speech headings earlier in the same scene is an obvious compositorial error.

The only notable feature of the folio text which argues against prompt copy is the survival of both *Zanthia* and *Abdella* as the name of Mountferrat's Moorish lover. Throughout Act I she is addressed as *Zanthia* and she appears as *Zanthia* (once misprinted *Zanchia*) or *Zan.* in all Act I stage directions. All her speeches in Act I are headed *Zan.* The same character is called *Abdella* in all other stage directions, and speech headings are always *Ab.*, *Abd.* or *Abdel.* throughout the rest of the play. Of the six occasions where she is referred to by name in the text, five occur in Act I



where she is *Zanthia*. The sixth is a single *Abdella* in IV.2.<sup>10</sup> We have, then an example of discrepant authorial naming, one author in Act I using *Zanthia*, and the rest using *Abdella*. Since *Zanthia* is a far more appropriate name, in view of *Zanche* in *The White Devil* and *Zanthia* in *Sophonisba*, I shall call the Moorish villainess *Zanthia*, the name from Act I, where the speech headings have not been brought into line with the rest of the play.<sup>11</sup> Within the text, rather than in stage directions or speech headings, there is only one instance of *Abdella*, though the name occurs regularly in speech headings and stage directions after Act I. Some attempt has been made to rationalize the confused situation in the printed text. On the Moor's first entrance the direction reads *Enter Zanthia, alias Abdella with two letters* (*Knight of Malta*, I.1, p.72).

Brock's ingenious explanation of these anomalies is not ultimately convincing. She suggests, first, that Field's Act One, using *Zanthia* throughout, was already with the scribe before the rest of the acts were written and, second, that Fletcher introduced *Abdella* in Act II, having read and forgotten the contents of Act I. She continues

Massinger, before he took over in III.2 read Fletcher's part of the play, called her *Abdella*; and Field in V.2, having read Fletcher's and Massinger's contribution, likewise called her *Abdella*.

(Brock, p.cxvi)

Even if one grants not one but two playwrights with fallible memories, Fletcher forgetting Act I and Field his own work, there are problems here. It ignores the presence of the probable *plotte*, a document to which Brock draws attention on at least one other occasion (p.xcix) and it suggests a sequential rather than a simultaneous method of collaboration. This would work against the usual motive for collaboration at all; the need to save time.

There is nothing, then, in the text to show definitely whether, despite

these anomalies, Brock is right in postulating an original prompt book of 1617 as the copy text for *F 1647*, or whether we are dealing with a composite text representing at least two stages of annotation. In either case there has been significant intervention between authorial draft and folio text so evidence drawn from linguistic characteristics and stage directions is particularly vulnerable here. While linguistic, stylistic and theatrical features all suggest that three playwrights collaborated on *The Knight of Malta* there is virtually nothing in the play's inferrable paleography or orthography which survives to support such a division. Act II may perhaps be distinguished from the rest of the play by its use of *Luscinda* or *Lusc.* instead of the *Lucinda* and *Luc.* preferred elsewhere, but the *Valetta/Valletta* and *Colonna/Collonna* variations are indifferently distributed throughout the play and even within a single scene.<sup>12</sup>

With one notable exception there are very few signs in the plotting and dramaturgy of *The Knight of Malta* of the kind of discrepancies, inconsistencies and anomalies one associates with multiple authorship. The 'signs of hasty composition' discussed by Hensman fail to convince (Hensman, p.98). The *Velleda/Valetta* discrepancy she notes must be dismissed since the names refer to two different characters.<sup>13</sup> Discrepancies she detects in the treatment of Lucinda's religious status are no more convincing. It is true that Lucinda describes herself as only 'half a Christian' (III.4, p.947) before her confrontation with Miranda, whereas Colonna's Act V account has her fully committed to Christianity before her marriage (V.2, p.94) but these are the result of contextual requirements. It is of no more significance than discrepancies readily discernible in the work of a single author.<sup>14</sup>

The play is coherently and consistently plotted, so any collaboration was obviously close. The varying plot strands offer a useful guide, at least



initially. Act II, for example, introduces entirely new characters in Colonna and Lucinda. Norandine is referred to several times in the text of Act I but is not developed as a comic character until his first appearance in Act II. The story of Mountferrat's accusation against Oriana is fully resolved by the end of Act II when she is triumphantly vindicated by the trial by combat. A fresh start seems to be made in III.2 with Gomera's accusation of adultery while the rest of Act III is concerned with Lucinda, the Turkish captive. The second story involving Oriana is further developed in Act IV and resolved in Act V, but its culmination is overshadowed by the ceremonies of Mountferrat's degrading and Miranda's admission to the Order of the Knights of St John. These narrative elements are intertwined with considerable skill. When Miranda rather than Oriana is seen to be the central protagonist, it is clear that the play's narrative diversity is not a sign of hasty and inadequate collaboration but an important contributor to the comprehensive and unified exploration of what it means to be a Knight of Malta.<sup>15</sup> The virtues and fallibilities of its hero are demonstrated through a developing series of parallels and contrasts.

Thematic coherence is not confined to plays of single authorship and there is one contrary reason for regarding *The Knight of Malta* as a collaboration. This is the existence of three different but co-extensive time schemes.<sup>16</sup> Though indifference to consistency in the handling of time is common enough in both collaborative and unaided plays of the period, the incompatibilities of *The Knight of Malta* are greater than can reasonably be ascribed to the carelessness or design of a single author.<sup>17</sup>

Act I and Act II each cover the events of a single day and are consecutive. In I.3 Oriana is accused of treachery and the trial by combat, shown in II.5, is arranged for 'tomorrow morning in the valley here' (*The Knight of Malta*, I.3, p.7) At the same meeting in I.3 Miranda, refusing



immediate membership of the order, asks for 'some small time' to 'rectifie' himself, and is dispatched to help Norandine in the sea battle against the Turks. In the battle that begins Act II they are victorious. As a result, Lucinda is awarded to Miranda and the disguised Colonna enters Miranda's service. Mountferrat and Miranda arrange the substitution and the combat takes place. Oriana and Gomera are married and Miranda, accepting his probationary robe, is sent to St. Thomas Fort. After a scene of virtually irrelevant comic padding, Act III continues with Gomera's gift to his newly married wife of the booty that resulted from the Act II battle and tells her of Lucinda's allocation to Miranda. Lucinda is told that Miranda has been at St Thomas' Fort for only three days (III.3), and her interview with him follows the same night (III.4). When in IV.2, immediately after this interview, as he states in V.2, Miranda visits the Temple, he finds Oriana, still suffering the results of the drug administered by the Moor at the end of III.2. This is expected to wear off, according to the Moor's account within six hours of her telling Mountferrat about it (IV.1). On this scheme, then, the events of Acts III and IV take place a few days after Acts I and II, with only enough time to allow for Oriana's funeral between them. But this time scheme is clearly impossible, ignoring as it does Oriana's pregnancy and the expiry of Miranda's probationary period, both fundamentals of the plot. The play as a whole must cover a period of time long enough to encompass Oriana's pregnancy, safe delivery and stay at Miranda's fort, and must also span Miranda's probationary period. This, though not specified at the time he actually receives his probationary robe, is, according to V.1, 'the yeere expir'd.' Thus, between the ceremonial ending of Act II, when Miranda receives the robe just before the marriage of Oriana and Gomera, and Miranda's actually entering the Order in V.2 is the passage of a year. Though by the first time scheme there is no real gap between Acts II and III, by III.2 Oriana is 'great with child' as both the scene and Gomera's summary in V.2 make clear. In



IV.2 Miranda, contradicting the explanation he gives in V.2, visits the Temple because 'I am to take the Order' and rescues Oriana who is on the point of giving birth to the 'lusty boy' born in IV.3. V.1 opens on the morning of Miranda's investiture and must therefore follow immediately after his interrupted vigil at the Temple. Here a third time scheme has been introduced since Oriana has clearly been at the fort for long enough for her to recover from childbirth and for her presence to become the potential cause of malicious gossip. By V.2 Gomera has undergone a period of penitential mourning.

The handling of time in *The Knight of Malta* could be considered a simple case of a double, or, in this instance, triple, time scheme. A lengthy time span demanded by its narrative is simultaneously compressed to increase dramatic intensity. By this account inconsistencies introduced in V.1 and V.2 could be dismissed as mere carelessness over incidental details. They do not, in themselves, necessarily suggest a different author. Difficulties with the precise timing of the Temple scene, for example, would easily pass unnoticed or be ignored in performance and are probably not important. But the problems that follow from the intersecting time schemes of III.2 are of a different order and are best explained by multiple authorship and inadequate meshing of independent combinations.

There is one further factor which points strongly to the play's being the work of more than one author. In the lengthy analysis of the play's relationship to its sources which forms the greater part of the introduction to her edition, Brock finds that the play demonstrates very specific knowledge of Malta's history and topography, and of the organization, ritual and manners of the Order of St John of Jerusalem. She then convincingly demonstrates that this specialised knowledge, though present to a very small degree throughout the play, is particularly important in Acts I and V (Brock, xcvi-)

ci). As she explains these acts show

a specialized knowledge which not only exists nowhere else in the play; it exists nowhere else in dramatic literature. Since this knowledge is rather evenly distributed throughout the acts [I and V], it must be supposed that a single author is responsible for both.

(Brock, ci)

The references and names used in the rest of the play and the characteristics of the Order referred to in these acts are 'so unspecific as to suggest that they are based on general knowledge or derived from Acts I and V.' (Brock, xcix).

Acts I and V are the product of a single author who was not responsible for the rest of the play. This is also suggested by the way prose, verse and rhyme are used in the play.

Acts I and V are chiefly distinguished by their use of rhyme. The only other scene to have a significant amount of rhyme is III.3. There is no rhyme at all in Act IV and scarcely any in Act II or the rest of Act III. Even more marked is the distribution of prose in the play: apart from thirteen lines in IV.2 all the prose occurs in Acts I and V.

Acts I and V can also be distinguished from the rest of the play on linguistic grounds, though these must be treated with some scepticism in view of the uncertainties about the copy for the extant text. Acts I and V differ from the rest of the play in use of contracted forms, indifference to *you* or *ye* and preference for both *hath* and *doth* (Hoy, IV, p.98).

The rest of this chapter will show that the playwright whose linguistic and prosodic characteristics emerge from Acts I and V of *The Knight of Malta* is Nathan Field.



### (i) Linguistic

Identifying linguistic forms as the work of particular playwrights is attended with difficulty in *The Knight of Malta* because of the intervention of scribe and/or book-keeper, but enough remains in the linguistic patterns of Acts I and V to allow a speculative attribution to Field. There is one occurrence of *'we* in V.2 (p.94) where it stands for *with you*. This could well be a compositorial version of Field's *w'ee*, complete with a Fieldian misplaced apostrophe. *You* predominates over *ye* but both forms occur in I.1, I.3 and V.2. *Hath* and *doth* are coincident in I.1, I.3, V.1 and V.2, and *hath* also appears in I.2. *'em* is regularly preferred to *them* but both forms appear in I.1, I.3 and V.1. *Em* is also found in I.2 and V.2. *Oth* in I.1 and *o'the* in V.2 can be set alongside *o'thy* and *o'my* in V.2 and *ith* in I.3. There is also an unusual contracted form *sh'd* (p.94) in V.2. *Whilst* occurs in I.1 and V.1, and *twixt* in I.1. *Thou'rt* appears in V.1 but I have found no examples of *th'art* or *ha'*. *Toth* in V.2 (*Knight of Malta*, V.2, p.94) might be analogous to Field's *byth*.

### (ii) Prosodic

Variety of tone and style is the most obvious feature of the verse of Acts I and V of *The Knight of Malta*. In I.1 Mountferrat gets the play off to an energetic start with his forceful opening soliloquy ending in an aggressive couplet

The wages of scorn'd Love is banefull hate  
And if I rule her not, Ile rule her fate.  
*Rocca*, my trusty Servant, welcome.

(I.1, p.71)

Within a few lines, however, the pace and tone change to a simple lyricism as he addresses his mistress

Oh my black Swan, silkner than Signets plush,  
Sweeter than is the sweet of Pomander,  
Breath'd like curl'd *Zephyrus*, cooling Lymon-trees,...

(I.1, p.72)

The next short scene is in bawdy colloquial prose, and this is immediately followed by a ceremonial scene in ornate rhetorical verse. Act V is even more varied. V.1, for example, mingles verse and prose so closely that it is difficult to be certain which is which. The Miranda/Norandine exchanges at the opening of the scene are notable here. After passages of more regular verse the scene ends on a couplet. The second scene is similarly varied, though the prose content is less. Again metrical regularity breaks down under the pressure of the play's emotional climax and the shared lines of the speakers as Gomera orders 'Women unvaile' (p.94). Before the dignified rhetoric of the final ceremonies Norandine provides us with more lively prose:

a plague o' your bacon-face, you must be giving drinks with a vengeance; ah thou branded bitch: do'ye stare, gogles, I hope to make winter-boots o' thy hide yet...

(V.2, p.94)

Colonna's account of his life follows immediately in a flat, rather uninteresting verse whose metre can scarcely contain the compression of his narrative.

My name is *Angelo*, though *Colonna* vaild it,  
Your Country-man and kinsman born in Florence,



Who from the neighbour Island here of Goza  
Was captive lead, in that unfortunate day  
When the Turk bore with him three thousand soules;  
Since in Constantinople have I liv'd  
Where I beheld this Turkish Damosel first.

(V.2, p.94)

Three lines after the end of his speech we are back in prose.

The distribution of rhyme in *The Knight of Malta* supports the idea of Field's authorship of Acts I and V. In these acts all scenes bar I.2, a prose scene, end in a rhyming couplet. Apart from the Corporal's round, a later addition, there is no rhyme at all in III.1 or III.4 or in the whole of Act IV. III.2 and III.3 have only end scene rhymes. There is only one couplet in Act II. By contrast, rhyme is frequent in Acts I and V.

Couplets are used in proverbial summary (*Knight of Malta*, I.1, p.72), to complete an episode (*Knight of Malta*, V.2, p.93), to emphasise the finality of a refusal (*Knight of Malta*, V.1, p.92) and to summarise events so far (*Knight of Malta*, V.2, p.94). Rhymes mark entrances (I.1, p.71) and exits (*Knight of Malta*, I.1, p.73; I.3, p.74; I.3, p.75).

### (iii) *Textual and Accidental*

There are three obvious examples of misplaced apostrophes, *our's* in V.1, *'we* and *do'ye* in V.2, though these need not be Field's since we know that there has been scribal and compositorial intervention in the text. Acts I and V contain ten of the eleven instances of the *All* speech headings in the play. This is the consistent form of the folio. Field's usual form is *Omnes*, but the Latin, like his characteristic Latin stage directions absent from this text,

may have been normalised by scribe and/or book-keeper - or even compositor. In Acts I and V some of the speeches headed *All* are clearly formal responses demanded by the ceremonial. 'Tis granted', 'He's free from all these' and 'Welcome, our noble brother' in V.2 are presumably rehearsed unison speeches demanded by the ritual, and it is possible that 'None can, great Master', 'All this was so' and 'It cannot be denide' in I.3 are also intended to be spoken by all the assembled knights. But 'This is strange' and 'This scene is strangely turnd' in I.3 and 'How's this!' in V.2 function in exactly the same way as, for example, *Amends for Ladies's* 'Here's a quoile, with a lord and his sister' (*Amends*, II.4.43) or 'Whose this, whose this!' (*Amends*, I.1.393) in commenting on, or clarifying, the dramatic action. The non-unison, permissive nature of Field's *All* is made clear by Gomera at Oriana's unveiling:

Somebody, thank Heaven  
I cannot speak.  
*All.* All praise be ever given.

(*Knight of Malta*, V.2, p.94)

The spelling *winck* (I.1, p.73, I.3, p.75) may be a residual Field spelling though we cannot make <sup>too</sup>~~two~~ much of this since *ranck* and *sincks* appear in III.3 (p.85) and IV.2 (p.89) respectively.

Since Field and Ralph Crane, the putative scribe of the *Knight of Malta's* copy text (Brock, pp.xiii-xv) share a fondness for bracketted vocatives their presence is not particularly indicative. I have not detected any notable examples of Field's non-syntactical brackets in this play.



(iv) *Theatrical*

Acts I and V of *The Knight of Malta* show the same fascination with stage spectacle as Field's other plays. V.2, in particular, with its long processional entry, its detailed concern with grouping and its extended ceremonial is characteristic of Field. Taking his material directly from the source in the *Statuta Hospitalis Hierusalem* Field adapts it to allow question and answer to alternate, an effect that needs careful staging to work (Brock, xlix-lviii). Paired songs are important to the scene as they are in *The Queen of Corinth* and *The Fatal Dowry*.

The staging of the reconciliation of Gomera and Oriana demonstrates a familiar Field technique.

Gom. Women unvaile.  
Ori. Will you refuse me yet?  
Gom. My wife!  
Val. My sister!  
Gom. Somebody, thank Heaven  
I cannot speak.  
All. All praise be ever given:

(*Knight of Malta*, V.2, p.94)

This is directly comparable with a similar moment at the climax of *A Woman is a Weathercock* (*Weathercock*, V.2, 165) where reticence replaces dialogue and the power of the scene lies in its movement.

The way names are used in Acts I and V is similar to Field's. Mountferrat's history is given within half a line of the play's opening. His servant Rocca is named on entry and he is addressed by name twice more within thirty lines. The Moorish girl is addressed five times by name in a single short episode of seventy lines. Zanthia, similarly, addresses Mountferrat by name. The ceremonial context establishes the names of

'these [two] gentlemen standing in your sight' as *Miranda* and *Gomera*, and the names of the chief protagonists are repeated frequently within the scene.

The opening of Act V is equally clear:

Gentle Lucinda  
Much must I thank thee for thy care, and service.  
And may I grow but strong to see *Valetta*  
My husband, and my brother, thou shalt finde  
I will not barely thank thee.

(*Knight of Malta*, V.1, p.92)

All those on stage except Oriana are named, most more than once, in the first forty lines of the act. She is addressed by name after a further ten lines and regularly thereafter. Names are used constantly throughout the final scene, with exchanges like

*Ori.* What is't *Miranda*?  
*Mir.* That you would please *Lucinda* might attend you.  
*Col.* That suit sir I consent not to.  
*Luc.* My husband?  
My dearest *Angelo*?

(*Knight of Malta*, V.2, p.94)

or

...take thy wife *Miranda*,  
Be henceforth called our Malta's better angell  
And thou her evil *Mountferrat*.<sup>18</sup>

(*Knight of Malta*, V.2, pp.94-5)

The only prepared and covered entry in the play occurs in I.2/I.3 as Zanthia tells the ladies that Oriana is 'entring the Tarrase, To see the show'. Miranda's sudden denunciation of Oriana in Act V, an action seemingly totally out of character, can be paralleled by the Maid's surprising acceptance of her brother's wedding plans (*Amends*, V.1.149) and Lady Orleans' false



admission of guilt (*Honest Man's Fortune*, I.2, p.253). His swift explanatory aside to conciliate the spectators 'Yet I will try her to the very block' (*Knight of Malta*, V.1, p.93) is shared with both Theanor and the Queen in *The Queen of Corinth*. All the moments of direct contact with the spectators come in Acts I and V. The only extended soliloquy opens the play and Mountferrat confides in the spectators three more times before the end of the scene. Miranda has a brief soliloquy in II.2 but Gomera's reflections in IV.2 are part of a complex overhearing scene, not direct address. Norandine's account of Miranda in II.1 is shared with the soldiers who attend him, one of whom replies. During his test of Oriana in V.1 Miranda shares his feelings directly with the spectators. There is no solo speech at all in Act III. Acts I and V also include almost all the ensemble speech of the play. This is not only because I.3 and V.2 are centred on meetings of the 'auberge'. Many of these scenes are developed beyond duologue. By contrast most of Act III is structured on a series of duologues. Other group scenes are II.5, the trial of Oriana, III.1, the comic scene involving Norandine and the Watch, and the sequences involving the discovery of Oriana at the tomb.

Acts I and V are very accurately located in Malta and their emphasis on the ceremonies, habits and customs of the Knights has minimised other kinds of topographical or theatrical reference. I can detect little of Field's usual manner here.

#### (v) *Literary*

The diction of Acts I and V is like Field's. He makes use of Latin words in their root sense. During the first meeting of the knights these

appear to achieve the necessary formality. Valetta asks Gomera 'What do ye object?' and tells him to 'explicate your thoughts' (*Knight of Malta*, I.3, p.74). Mountferrat orders 'Confer these letters' and Miranda asks for time to 'rectifie my Selfe' (*Knight of Malta*, I.3, p.74). The unusual word *endue* in V.2 (p.94) may be repeated from 'Love' (*Four Plays*, 'Love', p.35). Field relishes unusual vocabulary particularly that with specific technical meanings. Acts I and V establish the play's setting in the customs and ceremonies of the Knights of St John by having the only instances of their technical vocabulary: *auberge* (I.3, p.74; V.1, p.92), *conventicle* (I.3, p.74), *esguard* (V.2, pp.93,95).<sup>19</sup>

Field's preferred adverbial comparative in *-ier* is found only in these acts in *Gentlier* (I.1, p.71), *heavenlyer* (V.1, p.93) and *Fittlier*, misprinted *fittiler* (V.2, p.94).

The play as a whole is remarkably free of oaths and expletives. *Faith* in I.2 is not worthy of comment but *pish* and *humh*, misprinted *hunch*, both in I.1 may be indicative.

Brock (pp.cv-cvi) follows Brinkley (pp.63-64) in commenting on the violence of Field's figurative language. Comparing the storm, water and fire images from the opening scenes of *A Woman is a Weathercock* and *The Knight of Malta*, Brock remarks on 'the generally restless, windy, buffeted effect characteristic of Field'. She might have added that the way such effects are used to build characterisation and to get the plays off to a strong start is also similar. Mountferrat's extravagance is counterpointed later in the scene by the cool reactions of Astorius and Castriot as they look on. The same effect is achieved in *A Woman is a Weathercock* when the hollow rhetoric of Bellafront's letter and of Scudmore's reaction to the revelation of her betrayal is deliberately undercut by Neville's flat tones.

There are many passages in *The Knight of Malta* which parallel those in Field's other work.



Hunch - I have read Ladyes enjoy'd, have by  
The gulphes of worthiest men, buried their names  
..... woman then  
Checking or granting, is the grave of men.

(*Knight of Malta*, I.1, p.72)

This collocation - of love, 'gulphes' and grave pits - is also present in *A Woman is a Weathercock* when Scudmore chastises Bellafront (*Weathercock*, III.2.193) and in *Amends for Ladies* where there are several instances. Seldom is thankful that Grace is not

a dame, whose eies did swallow youth  
Whose vnchast gulph together did take in  
Masters and Men, the Footboies and their Lordes.

(*Amends*, II.1.166)

The idea of love as a pit 'which, when we fall into, we ne're get out againe' (*Amends*, I.1.416) and of men as

...betrayers, and their breasts  
As full of dangerous gulphes, as is the Sea

(*Amends*, II.3.54)

shows a similar association of love, 'gulphes' and grave pits as the passage from *The Knight of Malta*.

A rhymed passage summarising the conditions of wife, maid and widow introduces a major theme of *Amends for Ladies*

*Widow.* A wife is like a garment vsde and torne:  
A maid like one made up but never worne.  
*Maid.* A widow is a garment worne thred-bare,  
Selling at second hand, like Brothers ware.

(*Amends*, I.1.55)

Oriana makes use of a similar proverbial expression when she tells Miranda

How much you undervalue your own price,  
To give your unbought selfe, for a poore woman,  
That has been once sold, us'd and lost her show?  
I am a garment worne, a vessell crack'd...

(*Knight of Malta*, V.1, p.93)

One might dismiss the connections between the Widow and Oriana as merely proverbial were it not that their contexts are similar. Like the Queen in *The Queen of Corinth* the ladies are attracted by younger, less experienced men, but refuse for their sakes to give in to them despite their own desires. Similarly when Oriana urges Miranda to continue chaste she says

Think on the legend which we two shall breed  
Continuing as we are, for chastest dames  
And boldest Souldiers to peruse and read,  
I and read thorough, free from any act  
To cause the modest cast the booke away,  
And the most honour'd Captaine fold it up.

(*Knight of Malta*, V.1, p.92)

These words are echoes of Euphanes' (*Queen of Corinth*, IV.3.17), Veramour's (*Honest Man's Fortune*, p.164) or Dorigen's ('Honour', p.30). Though concern with reputation is commonplace, the parallels need not be ignored. The situations are similar - in each the speaker is urging the listener to desist from a dishonourable course of action.<sup>20</sup> The figures from *The Queen of Corinth* and *Four Plays* all share the idea of the reader of the future throwing away the book of posterity, and 'the Triumph of Honour' is additionally linked to *The Knight of Malta* by the verb *breed*, oddly used in connection with *legend* and *story*. When, in the following scene, Miranda praises Oriana



...busie nature  
If thou wilt still make women, but remember  
To work 'em by this sampler...

(*Knight of Malta*, V.2, p.94)

he echoes Pendant's praise of Count Frederick

Nature her selfe hauing made you, fell sicke  
In loue with her owne worke, and can no more  
Make man so louelie, being diseased with loue.

(*Weathercock*, I.2.52-4)

and Novall Junior's of Bellapert

This heauenly piece, which nature hauing wrought,  
She lost her needle and did then despaire,  
Euer to worke so liuely and so faire.

(*Fatal Dowry*, II.2.69-72)

The idea is repeated by Aymer when he describes Novall Junior himself as 'nature's copy that she workes forme by' (*Fatal Dowry*, IV.1.67)

Also reminiscent of Field's other work are the bawdy exchanges between Oriana's gentlewomen. Very characteristically the talk is all of marriage and, more specifically, of the duties of husband and wife. The women share the sentiments of the Maid in *Amends for Ladies* (*Knight of Malta*, I.2, p.73 and *Amends for Ladies*, I.1). The quick bawdy prose of I.2 of *The Knight of Malta* builds to the climax using classical allusion for comic rather than serious effect.

...did you never read of *Europa* the fair, that  
leapt A bull, that leapt the Sea, that swoom To land and then  
leapt her?

2. Oh heavens, a bull?

1. Yes, a white bull.

2. Lord, how could she fit him? where did she hold?
1. Why, by the horn: since which time, no woman  
(almost) is contented, till she have a horne of  
her own to hold by.

(*Knight of Malta*, I.2, p.73)

There is an attractive coda to all this. Brock has established that the playwright of Acts I and V depended on *Statuta Hospitalis Hierusalem*. She notes that of all the playwrights who might be thought to have had a hand in *The Knight of Malta* Field is the most likely to have had access to this. As a member of the Children of the Revels he would, she presumes, have visited the workshops of the Revels Office. Until 1608 The Office of the Revels was in Clerkenwell in a building formerly occupied by those Knights whose statutes provide the basis for the play. Brock's proposition has a certain charm but should, perhaps be dismissed as a lucky coincidence. There is fortunately no need to rely on it. The case for Nathan Field's authorship of Acts I and V of *The Knight of Malta* based on external and internal evidence is a strong one.



## NOTES

1. The play appears as '...ght of Malta' on a fragment of paper later revised by Sir George Buc of the Revels Office in writing his history of ~~Raleigh~~ <sup>Richard III</sup>. See E.K.Chambers, 'Review of *The King's Office of the Revels, 1610-1622*, RES 1 (1925); Marcham, *The King's Office of the Revels, 1610-1622...* (London, 1925).
2. *Jac. and Car. Stage*, I, 65-66; E.K.Chambers, 'Plays of the King's Men in 1641', in *Collections*, Malone Society (Oxford, 1911), I, 4 and 5, pp.364-369.
3. *The Knight of Malta* occupies leaves 5I4-5M4. See also W.W.Greg, 'The Printing of the Beaumont and Fletcher First Folio of 1647', *The Library*, 4th series, 11 (1922), pp.109-15; R.C.Bald, *Bibliographical Studies in the Beaumont and Fletcher folio of 1647*, Supplement 13 to *The Library* (Oxford, 1938 (1937)), pp.8-12.
4. The other names were John Underwood, Henry Condell, Robert Benfeild, John Lowin and Thomas Holcome.
5. The Revels Office list containing the first extant reference to the play must date from in or before 1619 since Sir George Buc's *History of Richard III*, for which the scrap had been used, carries the legend '...in the King's Office of the Re[ve]ls, Peters Hill the...of...1619'. Additional confirmation for this comes from a note written against the play immediately following '...ght of Malta' on the list - the '...nd part of Falstaff' - which we learn has not been '[p]laid yeis 7 yeares'. *Henry IV, Part 2* was performed only twice at court, in 1607 and again in 1612/13. Marcham, p.33; *Eliz. Stage*, p.484, Nungezer, p.79; *The Devil is an Ass* I, III.1.68; *Dramatic Records in the Declared Accounts of the Office of Works, 1560-1640*, edited by F.P.Wilson and R.F.Hill, Malone Society Collections, 10 (Oxford, 1975 (1977)).
6. *The Knight of Malta*, edited by Marianne Brock (unpublished doctoral dissertation Bryn Mawr College, 1944), p.vi. The parallels are discussed pp.lxxii-lxxxvii. Her scholarly edition has been very useful in this chapter, though I disagree with some of her conclusions.
7. Bertha Hensman, *The Shares of Fletcher, Field and Massinger in Twelve Plays of the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon*, Jacobean Drama Studies, 6, 2 vols. (Salzburg, 1974), pp.72-75. I can find no record of a special court performance for the Spanish ambassador Gondomar in September 1618 at which 'the Venetian ambassador... was in all probability present' (Hensman, p.75). Though James's relations with Spain, Italy and France fluctuated considerably throughout his reign, the Spanish were certainly more in favour in 1618. But the play is very little



concerned with national characteristics (apart from the usual comedy at the expense of the Danes as heavy drinkers). The original Knights of St John were organised into 'auberges' of different 'langues' so the inclusion of different nationalities is implicit in its setting. The complimentary allusions to Spain and Italy that Hensman describes are not immediately obvious. It is true that the undoubted villain of the play is the French knight, Mountferrat, but both Gomera, the Spaniard and Miranda, the Italian, are flawed heroes. Gomera's passionate jealousy seems to kill his virtuous wife while Miranda only dedicates himself to chastity when Oriana is denied him. Hensman's date of September 1618, though no less likely than any other in the period 1617-1619 must remain a speculation. Mary Susan Steele, *Plays and Masques at Court during the Reigns of Elizabeth, James and Charles* (New York, 1926, reissued 1968); *Jacobean and Caroline Revels Accounts, 1603-1642*, edited by W.R.Streitberger, Malone Society Collections, 13 (Oxford, 1986); *Dramatic Records in the Declared Accounts of the Treasure of the Chamber, 1558-1642*, edited by David Cook and F.P.Wilson, Malone Society Collections, 6 (Oxford, 1962).

8. Brock, pp.xviii-lx and Hensman pp.75-80 differ in their lists of these sources and disagree on their relative importance. Brock is more convincing than Hensman in her insistence on the play's historical qualities and the originality of its plots. I am convinced by Brock's demonstration of how the romance elements of the play derive from common stock and are not due to any one romance. William Painter, *The Palace of Pleasure*, edited by Joseph Jacobs, 2 vols (first edition 1566-7; London, 1890), I, pp.285-333; II, pp.355-362, Antoine le Maçon, *Le Decameron de M. Jean Boccace* (Paris, 1614), *Statuta Hospitalis Hierusalem* (Rome, 1586), Richard Knolles, *The Generall Historie of the Turkes* (London, 1603) and George Sandys, *A Relation of a Journey* (London, 1615).
9. See Bald, p.105 whose brief account does not include props or sound effects.
10. Zanthia/Abdella is an important, though largely silent character in V.2 but she is never addressed or referred to by name. *Abdella* appears only in the opening stage direction and in one speech heading. She is constantly returned to in opprobrious terms like 'devil's seed', 'black gib', 'branded bitch', 'chimney sweeper', 'coagent of your mischiefs' and so on. Clearly the character is conceived as a Moor first and foremost. Her actual name is of little significance though Zanthia means golden in Greek. Brock comments that when Fletcher wrote III.3 he 'simply thought of her as a Moor, and gave her the inevitable name of Abdella' (Brock, p.cxvi). Yet of the two names only Zanthia has a Moorish counterpart in other dramatic literature of the period. Zanthia is a character in John Marston's *Sophonisba*, a Queen's Revels play of 1606 in which Field almost certainly acted. The evil maid in *The White*



*Devil* is called Zanche. Abdella does not appear in any other play in the Bradford and Berger Index. There is no entry for any analogue of Abdella in OED. Thomas L. Berger and William C. Bradford Jr., *An Index of Characters in English Printed Drama to the Restoration* (Englewood, Colorado, 1975). Most of the names of characters in the play come from the historical material used as background. Oriana is a character in *The Woman Hater*, c.1606-7 now thought to be by Beaumont alone and it is used again in *The Wild Goose Chase* perhaps by Fletcher alone c.1621. Apart from an anonymous 1600 play, *The Weakest goeth to the Wall*, the only other usage is by James Shirley in *The Traitor* c.1631-34. See also Samuel C. Chew, *The Crescent and the Rose; Islam and England during the Renaissance* (New York, 1937), p.524 note 3.

11. The Zanthia/Zanche variants of the name are interesting in view of the misprint in *The Knight of Malta*, clearly a misreading of *c* for *t*. We have the same error in *The Honest Man's Fortune* where *mynt* is misread *minc*. Perhaps the handwriting in both instances was Field's but the misreading is common in secretary hand and the nature of the copy text differs.
12. *Luscinda* is not introduced until the second act. *Lucinda* or *Luc.* occur in III.3, III.4, IV.3, V.1 and V.2. While *Colonna* is used in III.4, IV.2 and *Collonna* in II.2, III.3, IV.3 and V.1 both forms are used in V.2. Similarly *Valetta* for both place and character is preferred in I.1, I.3, II.5 and V.1 while both *Valetta* and *Valletta* are used in V.2.
13. They are not variant forms. Velleda is the name of one of the gentlewomen, Zanthia's 'fellow'.
14. Hensman's case would be more attractive if it were not that she attributes a speech headed *Ab.* in IV.4 to Lucinda. It is the Moor who makes 'an extensive and defiant rejection of all Christian ceremonies' (Hensman, p.99).
15. Mountferrat acts as a strong contrast to the virtuous Miranda. His villainy is shown emblematically by the loss of his cross. Overemphasis on the source stories of the Duchess of Savoy and Katherine of Bologna lead both Brock and Hensman to centre their discussions of the play on Oriana.
16. See Brock, pp.cl-cli where she discusses the play's 'syncopation' without relating it to the authorship question.
17. *Othello* is perhaps the most obvious example of a purposive double time scheme.
18. There is something odd about the punctuation here. Valetta is not asking Miranda to take his wife. His remark is addressed to Gomera.

19. Field may also have in mind the 'escuyer' or 'equer' in his speech headed *Esq*, but this could as easily be a misprint for *Esg*, standing for *Esguard*. *Esguard* is the only reference given in *OED*.
20. In drawing attention to these parallels Hoy, writing of *The Queen of Corinth*, says that they have not been noted before. In fact they were first proposed by H.D.Sykes. Unfortunately since all the parallels occur in unattributed plays their presence can only be interestingly suggestive. Hoy, IV, p.100, H.D.Sykes, *Sidelights on Elizabethan Drama: A Series of Studies dealing with the Authorship of Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century Plays* (London, 1924).



**PART THREE: Theatre Plays**

## CHAPTER 9: Players and Stages



This chapter examines Field's work in terms of the staging demands he makes on the physical environment they inhabit. These are simple, flexible and, for the most part, entirely conventional. Only in his extensive use of stage doors is he unusual. Otherwise a bare platform is virtually all that is needed. Field writes for his players, not for property or scene men. Since nothing must stand in the way of direct communication between players and spectators theatrical high points are provided by people, not machinery or scenic effects. All is designed so that the burden of story telling is carried by the words and actions of the performers.

The door onto the stage is important to any actor. It is the barrier between off stage and on, the barrier behind which he waits before he enters the fictive world. <sup>It is not surprising</sup> ~~Not surprisingly~~, then, that Field, as actor *and* writer, is so aware of stage doors. In Field's plays and scenes doors are knocked on, peered through, locked, defended and attacked. A convincing off stage world is created by the players' voices so that the doors become part of the fiction while remaining quite obviously part of the theatre structure.

An episode towards the end of *A Woman is a Weathercock* may serve as an example. A masking party is awaiting the arrival of a vizard-maker.

*Count.* But do you thinke he will come at all?

*Om.* Oh, there he is. [*Scudmore*] *speakes within.*

*By your leave, stand backe, by your leave.*

*Enter Scudmore like a Vizard-maker.*

[*Scud.*] Nothing can be done tonight, if I enter not.

*2 Ser.* Stand backe there, or Ile burne you.

*Scud.* T'were but a whoorish tricke Sir.

*3 Ser.* Oh Sir <sup>i</sup>st you, Hart you'le be kild

*Scud.* Marry God forbid Sir.

*Nev.* Pray forbeare, let me speake to him...

(*Weathercock*, V.1.90)

This offers exciting opportunities for interaction between the players as, for example, the third servant suddenly realises the identity of the visitor. At the same time the need for Scudmore's disguise is confirmed visually to the spectators as the servants cluster round and bar the door. The same door becomes important later in the scene when the maskers, suitably attired and vizarded by the disguised Scudmore, leave the room, and his friend Nevill comments

So that doores fast, and they are busied.

(*Weathercock*, V.1.114)

The locking of doors provides crucial plot elements in two scenes of *The Fatal Dowry*. The blunt soldier Romont evicts the parasites from Novall Junior's room, and the Page comments to the audience

Ile eene away with 'em for this souldier beates  
man, woman, and child.

*Exeunt. Manent* NOVALL, ROMONT.

<i>Novall Junior</i>	What means you, sir? My people.
<i>Romont</i>	Your boye's gone.

*Lockes the door*

And the doore's lockt, yet for no hurt to you  
But privacy...

(*Fatal Dowry*, IV.1.152)

The plot line is here made clearer to the audience through physical action. Even without dialogue the relationship between the two men and the developing situation are both obvious. Earlier in the play, in trying to persuade Charalois of his wife's infidelity, Romont uses a similar strategy to ensure privacy - 'So the dore is fast' (III.4.401). Field's motive here is the same - to give the audience, through the movement of his players within the theatre building, visual signals that can reinforce, or even replace, the



dialogue. A similar approach with essentially practical objectives seems to underlie a curious piece of scenic construction and its accompanying stage directions in *A Woman is a Weathercock*. Scudmore, disguised on this occasion as a servant, insists on delivering a letter to Bellafront personally. When he enters the stage is very crowded. Her father comments 'A trustie servant, that way leads you to her', and the Count agrees, suggesting

Come,  
Let us to Bowles i'th Garden  
*Exeunt*

(*Weathercock*, III.2.65)

At this point at least eight people leave the stage and this is covered by Scudmore's single line 'Blessed fate'. Then follows

Scudmore *passeth one doore, and entereth the other,*  
*where Bellafront sits in a Chaire under a Taffata*  
*Canopie.*

(*Weathercock*, III.2.68)

Bellafront sleeps peacefully in her chair during a long impassioned speech by Scudmore, not waking until nearly twenty lines into the scene. Here the physical movement of the single player through the doors signals a relocalization of the stage space, obviating the necessity for explanatory dialogue - a kind of theatrical short hand.

An elegantly pragmatic development of this technique can be seen in a complex situation in *Amends for Ladies*. The Maid, as part of a plan to escape marriage to the elderly Count Feesimple, swoons. She is 'conveyed to her bed' off stage. Proudly fetches a Parson and a doctor who is, unbeknown to him, the disguised Ingen. The parson and the doctor enter the Maid's bedroom and the Parson '*shuts the doore*'. This door is subsequently found

to be locked. A little later a bracketed marginal direction is printed opposite the following dialogue

*Pr.* How fares she M<sup>r</sup> Doctor? Z'oons (looks in at  
Whats here? (the window  
*Bould, Widdow, Welt, Fees.* Hoy-Day  
*Husb., Wife, Seld, Subt.* How now?  
*Feesi.* Looke, looke, the Parson joynes the Doctors hand & hers;  
now the Do: kisses her by this light.

(*Amends*, V.2.163)

More commentary on the off stage action makes it clear that Ingen and the Maid are consummating their marriage. At the same time the Brother defends the door to the bedroom. The door, as door, becomes an important part of the play's fictive world, whilst at the same time remaining one of the theatre doors. Its relationship with the adjacent discovery space can be inferred from the staging demands at the resolution of this scene.

*Bro.* No breaking open doores, he that stirs first  
Ile pop a leaden pill into his guts  
... you shall not neede  
To breake the door, thei'll open it themselves.

*A curtaine drawne, a bed discovered, Ingen with his sword in  
his hand, and a Pistoll, the Ladie in a peticoate, the Parson.*

(*Amends*, V.2.174.178)

This episode is very ambitious in its use of the discovery space, involving as it does three players, a large piece of furniture and a great deal of action.<sup>1</sup> It is also extraordinary in combining the discovery space with a believably lockable door and a stage window accessible and convincingly large enough for a large group of people to look through. One may infer that two groups of players look through grilles or openings in the doors in the rear wall of either side of



the discovery space.<sup>2</sup> They are then well grouped to focus attention on the central area where the crucial plot episode is taking place. The marriage between Ingen and the Maid is shown economically and effectively by the sudden discovery of the marriage bed, the partly dressed Lady and the Priest. The door which the Brother guards so aggressively locates the neutral Elizabethan platform as outside the Maid's bedroom. With the drawing of the curtain the scene is swiftly and simply relocated. In this way considerable blocking difficulties involved in the movement of at least fourteen people are avoided. At the same time a culminating plot resolution is given dramatic emphasis by being shown visually, in a way that almost renders dialogue redundant. The actors use words to create the scene off stage. Suddenly offstage itself becomes part of the on-stage world of the play's fiction.

Peter Thomson, analysing an episode from *Everyman Out of his Humour* in which Fallace 'in furious dispute with her husband Deliro and with Macilente locks a stage door on her re-entry through it' comments

Jonson is here turning convention into reality. It is an example of his fascination with the material paraphernalia of his stage. But such direct use of the stage doors, unprotected by convention, is exceptional. Their normal neutrality is vital to the smooth conduct of a story.<sup>3</sup>

What is exceptional for Jonson and for Jacobean drama is usual for Field. His playful testing of convention and reality is an actor's strategy.

Field as both actor and playwright is very conscious of the stage platform itself, exploiting its possibilities in a variety of ways. His dramaturgy ranges from the most intimate of soliloquy to large scale processional pageant-like entries.

Enter in a Dumbeshewe: 2. Flamines. After them one bearing an offering for the Kinge: then 4. Senators, after them Titus Martius talking to Rufinus: Ieurchus [and] Leontius following,

then Philadelpha richly Attird, her Traine borne upp by Virgins  
all carrying in their hands severall kindes of sacrifice. So passe  
over the Stage.

(*Faithful Friends*, IV.2.24-76)

Allardyce Nicoll, arguing for 'entries at yard level from under the platform', suggests that 'pass over the stage' is a technical term implying the entry of actors into the yard who then walk onto and over the platform, leaving again at yard level.<sup>4</sup> Though *The Faithful Friends* direction I have just cited could be staged in the way Nicoll describes, the same cannot be said of the way the expression is used in *The Fatal Dowry*

*Here a passage over the Stage while the Act is playing, for the  
Marriage of Charalois with Beaumelle, &c.*

(*Fatal Dowry*, 1632, Fr; II.2.final sd.)

This direction in a play written for the King's Men but with implications of private theatre practice - 'whilst the Act is playing' is not easy to reconcile with Nicoll's interpretation of 'passing over', since there would be no yard in a private theatre. In the first of *Four Plays* a similar phrase appears

...a great flourish of Trumpets and Drums within Then, enter a  
noise of Trumpets sounding cheerfully. Then follows an armed  
Knight bearing a crimson Banneret in hand, with the inscription  
*Valour*: by his side a Lady ... Then *Dorigen* crown'd. Last, a  
Chariot drawn by two Moors, in it a Person crown'd, with a  
Scepter: on the top in an ancient Scutcheon, is written *Honour*.  
As they pass over, *Diana* ascends.

(*Four Plays*, 'Honour', p.32; Waller, p.311)

In this instance 'as they pass over' cannot, practically, apply to movement with a change of levels. The running of the chariot alone demands continuity. Field seems to use the phrase more loosely than Nicoll suggests,



merely to indicate large scale movement within the performance area.

Field requires maximum visibility for his players. His concern is primarily to maintain their contact with their audience. It is true that on two occasions in Field's scenes arrases are employed. In *The Faithful Friends* Tullius

...puts out ye Torch and stepps behinde ye Arras

But he is quick to make his action clear to the spectators.

Arras thou shalt hide my body,  
but light my understanding.

(*Faithful Friend*, IV. 4. 2622)

Similarly Lamira in *The Honest Man's Fortune* enters 'behinde the Arras' in order to 'observe this better' (*Honest Man's Fortune*, p.162; Waller, III.1. p.246). More often, however, Field prefers to leave his actors entirely visible so that they can be complicit with the audience. Indeed the Page in *A Woman is a Weathercock* might even have concealed himself among the spectators seated upon the stage at Whitefriars. The commentary that the Page, who 'conceales himself' in the second act of this play, makes upon what he sees, dictates a greater intimacy with the audience that an arras over a middle door in the back wall would allow.

*Page* Shee has a shrowde reach, I see that, what a casting shee  
keepes, marrie my comfort is, we shall heare by and by,  
who has give her the Casting Bottle.

(*Weathercock*, II.2.18)

The 'we' here clearly refers to himself and to the audience whom he is

addressing directly. Then we hear:

*Page* By this light I have heard enough, shall I holde your belly  
too, faire Maid of the fashion?

*Wag* What say ye Iacke Sawce?

(*Weathercock*, II.2.35)

Two solo speakers, Wagtail addressing the audience and the Page commenting on her soliloquy, join in the duologue. Wagtail must deliver her soliloquy from downstage but the Page too needs to be near enough to the audience for his asides to be fully appreciated. There is no way he could play the scene behind curtains or doors in a discovery space. Field is relying here, as always, on his actors alone, and calling on the convention of 'invisibility': the Page is hidden because Wagtail does not see him. The Page's use of 'we' identifies him strongly with the spectators and suggests physical as well as psychological proximity with the spectators seated on the stage. Hence my suggestion that he places himself among them in some way. Field's emphasis in this episode is on the actors' relationship with the audience and he exploits the disposition and organization of the stage itself to do so.

A more complex version of the same technique occurs later in the same play. The pregnant Wagtail and her lover Pendant decide that Sir Abraham Ninny must be gulled into believing that she is in love with him. He will then, they hope, propose marriage. Pendant and Wagtail arrange for Sir Abraham to 'overhear' Wagtail's soliloquy in which she declares passionate love for the foolish knight. The staging is complicated in that there are two, apparently unseen, eavesdroppers, and by the fact that Wagtail has arranged her performance for the benefit of one of these at the expense of the other. The audience is, of course, fully aware of the facts and can be expected to enjoy Wagtail's performance, admiring her skill in manipulating Sir Abraham. Field demands visible complicity between her and Pendant:



*Wag* Tis not thy legge, no, were it twice as good, throws me into  
this melancholy mood.

....

*Abra.* I, but all this while she does not name mee, shee may  
meane Sombodie else.

*Pen.* Meane sombodie else, you shall <sup>heare</sup>~~have~~ her name you by  
and by.

*Wag.* Courteous Sir *Abraham*.

*Pen.* Law ye there.

(*Weathercock*, IV.3.40. 44)

As the scene continues Pendant joins Wagtail, leaving Sir Abraham still  
watching, and commenting to himself and to the spectators on the action.

Wagtail reaches new heights of simulated passion:

Beare him this purse fil'd with my latest breath

*Blowes in it*

I lov'd thee *Abraham Ninnie*, even in death.

*Offers to stab*

(*Weathercock*, IV.3.92)

In the nick of time Sir Abraham leaps from his hiding place and Pendant  
remarks triumphantly

Looke, Sir *Abraham* in person comes to see you.

(*Weathercock*, IV.3.100)

Field's instinct for comic timing, and his reliance on his actors, dictate the  
staging of this scene. It is impossible for the watchers, Pendant and Sir  
Abraham, to be anywhere other than in full view of the audience  
throughout. By constructing the scene so that Wagtail is *necessarily* aware of  
their presence, Field makes a virtue of the 'audibility' and 'invisibility'

conventions. He avoids unnecessary complications and provides many opportunities for subtextual and extra-textual business in which spectators and players share.

It is likely that the scene in *Amends* where the Husband watches Subtle attempting to seduce the Wife is handled similarly, though here the Husband has no accompanying figure to whom to address his remarks. The spectators take this role.

Here will I hide my self, when thought as gone,  
If they doe ought unfitting I will call  
Witnesse, and straight way sue a divorce.

(*Amends*, V.1, 76)

There is no stage direction to indicate where he hides except the simple term *Exit*. He does not leave the stage area since Subtle comments on his presence and his re-entry to the scene is in dialogue continuous with Subtle's. Again complicity with the audience is needed.

Where comic effects depend on the immediacy of audience contact Field makes no use of discovery or arras, even when the demands of the narrative might suggest their use. By contrast, where narrative clarity and impact are the priority the discovery space is employed so that visual effects can reinforce dialogue. In *The Queen of Corinth*, for example, the private plotting of the sinister Crates and of Conon is strikingly contrasted with the dumbshow of public spectacle and acclaim which precedes their being 'discovered'. The discovery of apparent dumbshow figures whispering, and then going on to actual extended dialogue is unusual and effective. More conventional is the use of the discovery space in Field's part of *The Fatal Dowry*. As Rochfort offers to



...tender heere  
What ever you will take, gold, iewels, both  
All, to supply your wants

*(Fatal Dowry, II.2. 255)*

A marginal note explains '*Drawes a Curtayne*'. A pivotal moment of the plot is thus emphasised by a visual effect, accompanying and clarifying the dialogue.

The location of the Seldoms' shop in *Amends for Ladies* may have been established in the discovery space, on the analogy of *Eastward Ho*

*...At the middle dore, enter Golding, discovering a Goldsmith's shoppe, and walking short turns before it...<sup>5</sup>*

*Amends'* second act opens with

*Enter SELDOME his WIFE working as in their shop.*

*(Amends, II.1.1)*

Defining a location by placing properties within the discovery space is an economical way of telling the story and the 'as in' of Field's direction may call on this convention. The same phrasing recurs later in the play.

*Enter WELTRI'D and BOULD puting on his doublet, FEESIMPLE on a bed, as in Bould's chamber.*

*(Amends, IV.2.1)*

Here the drunken Lord Feesimple, recovering from his night out is the dramatic focus of this stage in the story.

Yet despite its apparent demand for a discovery space Field's dramaturgy is almost always flexible enough to allow staging in spaces

without this facility. Rochfort's gift to Charalois could as easily be enacted by servants carrying caskets of gold and jewels, as they do elsewhere in Field's work; later in *The Fatal Dowry* itself or in *The Honest Man's Fortune*, for example. Two stools and some appropriate hand props set by the actors themselves on the open stage would serve just as well to indicate the Seldoms' shop. No real 'discovery' is necessary. In any case the action flows out on to the main platform very quickly. 'The merry pranks of Moll Cutpurse', as the title page of the second quarto describes them, are not going to be confined to the discovery space and the back of the stage. The Proudly, Grace, Seldom exchanges are best staged by using the full width and depth of the stage platform.

*Pr.* Then i'll take a pipe of Tobacco heere in your shop if it be not offensive...Garsoon; fill sirrah.

*Enter PAGE with a pipe of Tobacco.*

What said the Goldsmith for the money?

*Seldome having fetch a candle, walk's off at th' other end of the shop; Lord sits by his wife.*

*(Amends, II.1.66)*

'Th' other end of the shop' is clearly on the main platform far enough downstage for Seldom to address the audience confidentially.

This custome in us Cittizens is good,  
Thus walking off when men talk with our wives.

*(Amends, II.1.84)*

The entry of Lord Feesimple in bed could be staged by using the discovery space, or by a bed being 'thrust out' as it is in *The Faithful Friends*.<sup>6</sup> However, Field's flexible dramaturgy allows a simpler solution; that a bed is carried on. Violanta's entry 'in a bed' is presumably done in the same way (*Four Plays, 'Love', p.35; Waller, p.322*). In this way the player in bed can be



well positioned, and this allows flexible grouping for the rest of those concerned in the scene.

Field's interest in placing his players swiftly and firmly on the open stage can also be seen in his handling of 'above'. In his plays and scenes there are only three which require entrances 'above'. In *The Queen of Corinth* the opening lines of IV3 make it clear that the castle in which Agenor and Leonidas hold Theanor is represented, quite conventionally, by the upper level.

*Enter Theanor, Agenor, Leonidas above*  
*Leo.* Make good that Fortification, and the Watch  
Keepe still upon the Battlements: Royall Sir,  
Weigh but our injuries...

....

*Enter Euphanes and Conon*

....

*Leo.* Beneath I doe perceive  
Two armed men...

(*Queen of Corinth*, pp.16-17; Waller, IV.3, p.56)

But unlike many playwrights Field keeps his players on the distant upper level for only a very short time. The confrontation with Euphanes and Conon takes place on the platform as Agenor insists 'let us descend'. In *The Knight of Malta*, as Zanthia's words make clear, Oriana appears *above*.

Hist, wenches: my Lady cals, she's entring the Tarrasse to see the show.

(*Knight of Malta*, p.73; Waller I.2, p.86)

Sure enough the opening direction of the following scene, continuous with Zanthia's words, is

*Enter (above) Oriana, Zanchia [sic], two Gentlewomen,  
(beneath) Valetta...*

An impressive stage picture establishes the dignity of the ceremonial, and the status of Oriana is clearly determined by this appeal to theatrical convention. But here again, Oriana only remains above while she is a *silent* observer. As soon as she has to participate significantly in the dialogue her brother orders her to 'Come down Lady' ( *Knight of Malta*, p.74; Waller I.3, p.90).

The practicality of Field's dramatic sense can be exemplified by the only other instance of 'above' in his works. This is '*Enter Powts above*' in a very brief scene in *A Woman is a Weathercock* where the term 'above' could refer as easily to a window above the door on which Strange knocks. An upper level would be useful to house the musicians for *A Woman is a Weathercock*'s frequent music cues but 'above' is not essential for the conduct of the play.

Field's basic requirements in the properties and furniture department are similarly minimal: a bed, bier, altar, chairs, tables, a few stools. Ingen and the Maid, Lord Feesimple, and Violanta are each seen in a bed. A similar object would be needed for the bier on which Violanta and Ferdinand are carried. A block representing an altar creates a tragic setting for Merione in *The Queen of Corinth* and a comic one for Sir Pergamus in *The Faithful Friends*. The same block could presumably be used as the scaffold mounted by Oriana in *The Knight of Malta*. A large chair is needed for *A Woman is a Weathercock* - 'Bellafront sits in a Chaire under a Taffata Canopie'.<sup>7</sup>

Stools are, as one might expect, in constant demand. Tables for banquets are also in frequent use.<sup>8</sup> Here again Field's essentially practical theatre experience is clear. He writes in extra business to cover the placing of necessary props and furniture. In *A Woman is a Weather<sup>c</sup>ock* Sir John Worldly's servants have to prepare for a large party coming to enjoy dancing



and a masque and this is covered by a comic sequence involving Lady Ninny. In *The Honest Man's Fortune* the extended banquet scene which ends the play is prefaced by a comic dialogue by the servants. The elaborate banquet of *The Faithful Friends* is preceded by extended business in seating the guests. In each of these examples Field ensures that the attention of spectators is not distracted from important dialogue and action later on by those setting the banquets in position: a practical strategy.

Apart from these conventional and readily available properties Field makes no further demands, despite plot lines which would allow the inclusion of more challenging items, like the mossbanks, rocks, tree of golden apples or the 'wheel and frame' for sieges and beheadings he might have used.<sup>9</sup> It is noteworthy that only once in his surviving work does he demand more than the simplest of props.

*Four Plays* is anomalous. We do not know its performance context but that presumably determined its use of scenery and stage machinery. In the plays' framing structure for which Field is responsible Cupid and Diana 'descend'. Valerius' entry 'like Mercury singing' may also demand a descent mechanism if his lines 'Jove sends me from above' are taken literally. *Four Plays* requires moveable scenery.<sup>10</sup> Cupid in Field's prologue to 'Love' orders 'Stay clouds, ye rack too fast'. That this refers to an actual scenic effect is suggested by a direction in Fletcher's 'Time'.

*...One half of a cloud drawn, Singers are discovered: then the other half drawn. Jupiter seen in glory.*

*(Four Plays, 'Time', p.47; Waller, p.363)*

Another much clearer demand for mechanical effects is the simple stage direction on which the whole plot of 'Honour' turns.

*A mist ariseth, the rocks remove.*

*(Four Plays, 'Honour', p.30; Waller, p.307)*

In the Field section of the entertainment, however, the emphasis is on human agency, not illusionist scenery as he uses what is available in a pragmatically theatrical way. Though Dorigen is deceived, the spectators are left in no doubt how the effect of the moving rocks is to be achieved. Valerius prepares for the moment by carefully explaining to Martius

...by my skill  
learn'd from the old Caldean was my Tutor  
who train'd me in the Mathematicks, I will  
so dazzle and delude her sight, that she  
shall think this great impossibilitie  
effected by some supernatural means...

*(Four Plays, 'Honour', p.30; Waller, p.307)*

Valerius and the spectators share the knowledge that 'this great impossibilitie' is a trick of the theatre. The focus of the episode is Valerius' skilful trickery and Dorigen's reactions to it, not the scenic effect itself. Valerius and the spectators are complicit in the deception of Dorigen and in the provision of a stunning visual moment.

Such moments are common in Field's other plays and scenes but there they are not provided by scenery. I turn in the next chapter to a discussion of how Field, working with richly costumed players on a bare platform and a minimum of other theatre resources, creates an extensive range of visual effects.



## NOTES

1. Richard Hosley suggests that at the Globe at least the discovery space would seldom include more than one stationary figure. R.Hosley, 'The Discovery-space in Shakespeare's Globe', *Shakespeare Survey*, 12 (1959), 35-46 (p.44).
2. One must infer that the stage doors at Whitefriars and at Rosseter's Blackfriars were both believably lockable and visible, and in the same plane as the discovery place. One of the doors, but better two, must have been equipped with some kind of opening, similar to those at second Blackfriars. Dapper, for example, is locked in the privy in *The Alchemist*, a Blackfriars (1610) play. Both doors must allow simultaneous viewing and logic demands that the door the Brother defends is the door the Parson 'locks'. The bed must be discovered in a location which does not contradict one implied by the 'locked' door since the action of the scene is continuous. John McCabe, 'A Study of the Blackfriars Theatre, 1608-1642' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Birmingham, 1954), p.81.
3. Peter Thomson, *Shakespeare's Theatre* (London, 1983), p.46.
4. I am aware that *The Faithful Friends* has no proven performance history but its staging can be inferred. Allardyce Nicoll, 'Passing over the Stage', *Shakespeare Survey*, 12 (1959), 47-55 (p.51).
5. Ben Jonson, George Chapman and John Marston, *Eastward Hoe* (London, 1605) sig. A2; William Peery, 'Eastward Ho and A Woman is a Weathercock', *Modern Language Notes*, 62 (1947), 131-2.
6. McCabe discusses 'thrusting out', pp.97-98.
7. That the 'taffata canopie' is not any kind of larger structure like Beatrice's 'woodbine couverture' or Sir Toby's 'boxtree' is suggested by W.A.Armstrong's discussion of 'canopie'. He concludes that though Chambers was right to identify 'canopy' with 'curtained recess' at the Paul's Boys' theatre it can also refer to 'a chair of state surrounded by a canopy'. Armstrong's examples are largely from later plays. This instance from *A Woman is a Weathercock*, not mentioned by him, is earlier confirmatory evidence. W.A.Armstrong, '"Canopy" in Elizabethan Theatrical Terminology', *Notes and Queries*, ns 4 (1957), 433-44.



8. For a discussion of the staging of banquet scenes see Christopher Douglas Meads, 'Banquet Scenes in English Drama, 1585-1642' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Birmingham, 1988).
  
9. These items are all listed on Henslowe's property list for the Admiral's Men, but one may assume that all companies had similar things available to them. *Henslowe's Diary*, edited by R.A.Foakes and R.T.Rickert (Cambridge, 1961), pp.319-21.
  
10. That moveable scenery was available on the stage as early as 1613 or so has been suggested by John Freehafer, with specific relevance to *Four Plays* as having been 'acted with scenery in a private playhouse under James I'. 'Perspective Scenery and the Caroline Playhouse', *Theatre Notebook*, 27 (1972-73), 98-113 (p.106). Allardyce Nicoll, referring to *Four Plays*'s demands for 'scenic display of a masque-like nature' nonetheless locates *Four Plays* on 'the ordinary public' stage. *Stuart Masques and the Renaissance Stage* (London, 1937), p.142. See also the discussion by Enid Welsford, *The Court Masque* (New York, 1927). Close parallels to some of the scenic effects demanded by *Four Plays* are provided by Thomas Campion's *The Lords Masque* (1612/13). The device, clouds breaking 'in twain', continues to be in use throughout the period. The movement of the rocks in 'Honour' finds a close parallel in Chapman's *Memorable Masque...the Middle Temple, and Lyncolnes Inne* (1613). During the performance 'the middle part of the Rocke began to move, and being come some five paces up towards the King, it split in peeces with a great crack' where 'the peeces of the Rock vanish't'. Thomas Campion, 'The Lord's Masque', edited by I.A.Shapiro in *A Book of Masques: In Honour of Allardyce Nicoll*, edited by T.J.B.Spencer and S.W.Wells (Cambridge, 1967), pp.95-123 (p.111); Thomas Middleton, 'Inner Temple Masque', or, *The Masque of Heroes*, in *The Works of Thomas Middleton*, edited by A.H.Bullen, 8 vols (London, 1886), VII, 197-216 (pp.213-4); George Chapman, 'The Memorable Masque', edited by G.Blakemore Evans in *The Plays of George Chapman: The Comedies*, edited by Allan Holaday (Urbana, Chicago and London, 1970), pp.557-586 (p.569),



## CHAPTER 10: Spectacle, Silence and Sound

Writing of *Volpone*, Philip Brockbank comments on how 'acted in silence its spectacle might still be made entertaining and significant'.<sup>1</sup> This chapter explores those aspects of Field's work of which the same can be said. The way in which stage pictures can complement, reinforce or even replace the images of dramatic poetry has been the focus of considerable scholarly attention but the emphasis has been on the second of Brockbank's adjectives rather than the first.<sup>2</sup> To some critics visual effects are only important when they serve literary ends. John Reibetanz, for example, writes dismissively of how in some Jacobean plays 'action gives way to ornament and [they] tend to become a series of set pieces' (Reibetanz, p.41). Marion Lomax, though recognising that

...the Elizabethans and Jacobeans could appreciate emblematic or symbolic staging because they, unlike us, were familiar with the concept - not just in relation to drama or masques, but in the emblematical way they viewed the world.

(Lomax, p.34)

nonetheless distinguishes between 'meaningful devices' and 'pure entertainment' (Lomax, p.11). Such distinctions have little relevance for Field when one substitutes theatrical values for literary ones. His visual effects are both 'action' *and* 'ornament'. Visual devices are both 'meaningful' *and* 'pure entertainment'. His sense of pictorial story-telling focuses turning points and climaxes into memorable dramatic moments whose appeal is as much to the eye as the ear. Dumbshows are characteristic; progressing, interrupting and reinforcing the significance of the narrative. His emphasis on ritual and ceremony allows opportunities for the players to entertain the spectators with their non-verbal skills. Thematic significance is reinforced by stage pictures.



Frequently, however, the 'silence' is filled with music so this chapter also considers how Field's many sound cues amplify and support the meanings of his stage pictures. For convenience the visual and sound elements in Field's work have been treated separately, even though Field's strength lies in his ability to combine them.

The evidence on which this discussion has been based must, of course, be purely verbal but close reading and theatre experience allow inferences to be drawn about the visual and aural impact of Field's scenes. His words reveal that he perceives scenes in terms of staged action; he sees players doing things as well as just speaking; even, on occasions instead of speaking. Field's verbal expression reveals him thinking visually. His presentation of spectacle is sometimes more confident and assured than his dialogue, but at his best Field fuses the visual and the verbal in mutually reinforcing moments of great theatrical impact. For these moments Field depends utterly on his players to produce the effects. As I have already shown he almost always eschews machinery, pyrotechnics, large stage properties. For him theatre consists of costumed players, moving or still, on the stage platform. The aim of his presentational technique is, to use Peter Thomson's word, to 'maximise' the presence of the players.<sup>3</sup> He gives his spectators clear stories whose shocks are frequently visual and whose stage pictures are always 'entertaining', and often 'significant'.

At its simplest Field's pictorial story-telling is conventionally economical: a jailer establishes Romont's imprisonment in *The Fatal Dowry*, a drawer the tavern in *Amends*, a priest the church in *Weathercock*. Costume always signifies.<sup>4</sup> To help the spectators with the story, characters are given some simple identifying signal as for example with Count Feesimple's furs (*Amends*), Lucida's willow garland (*Weathercock*), Ferdinand's black clothes ('Love') and Dorigen's blindfold ('Honour'). In

*The Honest Man's Fortune* Montague's change of fortune is clearly signalled by a change in costume. His appearance bare-headed marks a significant point in the plot, marking the shift in his social role. Emblematic conventions are exploited to the full in all Field's plays and scenes as victors and kings are crowned with bays, or as ladies, happily reunited with their menfolk, are ceremonially garlanded. From numerous examples I have selected two. In *The Queen of Corinth* the surrender of Agenor and Leonidas is made visually telling by the emblematic handling of their swords:

Ag.     There are our swords Sir, turn the points on us,  
Leo.    Punish rebellion, and revenge your wrong.  
Euph.   Sir, my revenge shall be to make your peace.

The stage picture is clear to read as Conon's comment on his return confirms.

How's this?   unarm'd left, now found double arm'd?  
And those that would have slain him at his feet?

He adds the moral that might have been found under just such an emblem in a book:

Oh Truth, thou art a mighty Conqueresse.

(*Queen of Corinth*, p.17; Waller, IV.3, p.59)

In a second example from *The Knight of Malta*, Mountferrat, 'transported' by lust, fails to notice two of his fellow knights waiting for him.

Cast.     Will you go Sir?  
Mount.    I cry you mercy: I am so transported  
            (Your pardon, noble Brothers) with a business  
            That doth concern all *Malta*, that I am  
            (Anon you'll hear't) almost, blind, and deaf.



Lust neither sees nor hears ought but itself:  
But I will follow instantly: your cross.

*Ast.* Not mine.

*Cast.* Nor mine, 'tis yours.

*Ast.Cast.* Good morrow Brother. *Exeunt*

The significance of the fallen cross is made clear by Mountferrat's next words:

White innocent signe, that do'st abhorre to dwell,  
So near the dim thoughts of this troubled breast

...

Yet I must weare thee to protect my crimes.

(*Knight of Malta*, p.72; Waller, I.1, p.83)

His comments reinforce the point and the falling of the cross becomes a useful signal to the spectators, guiding their responses to him. At the same time its allegorical significance underpins the rest of the play. Structurally this involuntary loss of the cross is recalled in Mountferrat's degradation at the end of the play when he is stripped of his knightly accoutrements. His crimes have been discovered: the cross cannot protect him.

Sometimes Field's insistence on emblematic moments leads him into difficulties, as in the following example from *A Woman is a Weathercock*. Confronted by two priests, one genuine and one the disguised Nevill who has actually performed the wedding ceremony, Count Frederick insists

I have the Priviledge then.

*World.* Right you were married first.

*Scud.* Sir John you doate

This is a Deuill in a Parsons coate.

*Nevill puts off the Priests weeds & has a Diuels robe under.*

*Om.* A prettie Emblem.

The Count draws the obvious moral:

Hart, what a deale a Knavery a Priests cloake can hide...

(*Weathercock*, V.2, 80)

The moment, though earning a laugh, is not entirely successful since it is too irrelevant, forced and perfunctory. It is not even very successful as a parody of the convention, were that Field's intention.

Field is a much better playwright when he is less crudely emblematic, or when stage picture, dialogue and situation work together to convey coherent meaning. *A Woman is a Weathercock* provides an example of the first, *The Faithful Friends* an example of the second, in their treatment of conventional material. Both plays involve masquers and a dance, but differ in their emblematic content.

The last scene of *A Woman is a Weathercock* opens with a masque under whose cover Scudmore intends to elope with Bellafront. 'The Musicke playes', the masquers enter. Their movements and the staging of the scene are tightly prescribed

*After one straine of the Musicke, Scudmore takes Bellafront who seemes vnwilling to dance, Count takes Lucida, Pendant Kate, Sir Abraham ,Mistris Wagtaile, Scudmore as they stand, the other Courting too, whispers as followes.*

(*Weathercock*, V.2, 8)

Some fifteen lines later we have

*Musicke, & they dance, the second strain; in which Scudm. goes away with her.*

*Om.Spect. Good verie good.*

*The other foure dance, another straine, honor and end.*

(*Weathercock*, V.2, 38)



In addition to the music and dancing the impact of the scene is provided by the 'masking robes' in which Sir Abraham and his companions enter in the previous scene, and, of course, in their masks. Field's fondness for comedy is exercised here. Abraham has commissioned 'a Vizard with a most terrible countenance' and is assured that he will be given 'A verie Divels Face' with a 'large Mustachioe'. He is proud of his 'rare face to fright the Maids i'th Countrey' (*Weathercock*, V.1. 84.85.109). The visual effect of the contrast between the fierce mask and Abraham's spindly legs must be laughable. The masque in *A Woman is a Weathercock* has little allegorical content, or symbolic value. It is primarily a plot device allowing, first, the exchange of the vizard maker disguise giving Scudmore access to Bellafront, and, second, their elopement. That the device is certainly impressive, probably comic and possibly beautiful to look at is a bonus.

Field is more openly emblematic in the masque in *The Faithful Friends*. This is more complex, though there are similar comments to draw attention to the players' skills in dancing.

how like the nimble windes wch play  
 vpon the tender grasse, yet press it not;  
 or flye ouer the christall face of smoothest  
 streames leaving no curle behinde them,  
 or how like the yellowe featherd Hymen when  
 he treads upon the softe ayres bosome, doth  
 she passe obser'vd with admiration, why shee  
 makes motion the God of every excellence  
 and what the muses would with study  
 fynde shee teaches in her dancing...

(*Faithful Friends*, IV.3, 2569)

In this play the masque has dramatic as well as theatrical point. The situation is familiar - a lover reflects on the beauty of his mistress's dancing.

The context here gives the convention an ironic, almost self reflexive twist. In this scene the speech prefaces lust and violence, for the king at this point in the play is no Romeo or Florizel. Philadelpha is an unwilling guest at the banquet. Her husband has gained entrance to the palace under cover of the masque.

Enter the Masque in w<sup>ch</sup> is young Tull Marius [and] Arman[us]  
[and] Lelia in Ladies habit they follow ye three young lords like  
furies after daun<s>e w<sup>th</sup> the Ladies

(*Faithful Friends*, IV.3. 2556)

Here the unassailable virtue of Philadelpha and the vengeance of her husband are exemplified in the costumed movements of the dance which the king, the potential victim, admires so much. Even without the accompanying commentary the spectacle would be significant and entertaining: its meaning would be clear to read in the appearance of the masquers 'like Furies' and the king watching Philadelpha dancing. With it, the texture of the scene is further enriched as words, music and spectacle combine to produce a memorable episode which serves both plot and theme.

The stage picture presented by Merione in III.2 of *The Queen of Corinth* is another of these occasions where visual images, dialogue, music and action coalesce to create a powerful scene. A victim of Theanor's rape, she confines herself, weeping in a darkened room hung with 'blacks' and lit only by tapers. Music feeds her grief. Her friends, her suitor Agenor and Leonidas comment on the picture she makes.

*Leo.* How like a hill of Snow she sits, and melts  
Before the unchast fire of others lust?  
What heart can see her passion and not break?

(*Queen of Corinth*, p.13; Waller, III.2, p.45)



To Agenor she is still the image of Chastity, and this is reinforced by the contrast between the whiteness of her dress and the blackness of the room. He questions

Wherefore sits  
My *Phebe* shadowed in a sable cloud?  
Those pearly drops which thou let'st fall like beades,  
Numbring on them thy vestal Orisons  
Alas are spent in vaine.

(*Queen of Corinth*, p.14; Waller, III.2, p.46)

The poetic conceit and Merione's stillness combine to arrest time for a moment as she becomes an emblem for all ravished virgins. But the silent figure of Merione and the black hangings of the room have more to contribute to the scene. They form a sombre background for the betrothal of Euphanes and Beliza which follows, creating a web of ironies and tensions to emphasise the giving of the fatal ring. This ring, a vital clue to the rapist's identity, has been planted on Euphanes, who in turn gives it to Beliza as a token of their love. Beliza rejoices

Who can be sad? out with these Tragick Lights,  
And let day repossesse her naturall howres:  
Teare downe these blacks, cast ope' the Casements wide,  
That we may jocondly behold the Sun.  
I did partake with sad *Merione*:  
In all her mourning: let her now rejoyce  
With glad *Beliza*, for *Euphanes* is  
As full of love, full of humility  
As when he wanted.

*Mer.* Oh - that.

*Leo.* Help, she faints:

Her griefe has broke her heart.

*Mer.* No - that - that.

Ag. Mistris, what point you at?  
Her lamps are out, yet still she extends her hand.

(*Queen of Corinth*, p.14; Waller, III.2, p.48)

Here the stage action, Merione's silent but frantic movements, her pointing, her faint, create a picture which tells the story more powerfully than any extended passages of dialogue. The pathos and accusation are carried by her moving figure

Still, still she points  
And her lips move, but no articulate sound  
Breathes from 'em.

(*Queen of Corinth*, p.14; Waller, III.2, p.48)

The commentary reinforces and articulates a stage picture which is already clear. Tension builds as the audience, fully aware of what Merione is trying to communicate, and knowing his complete innocence, wait for Euphanes' reaction. Silence at a moment of high dramatic tension is often preferred by Field. In this scene her silence contrasts strikingly with the others' feeling commentary. Her grieving figure, first static and then in movement, provides a fitting focus for an essential plot development, while sympathy for her plight is increased by her silent presence during a love scene played so inappropriately against the dark background. When all aspects of performance work together like this Field's talents as actor-dramatist are well demonstrated.

On other occasions Field's dialogue lacks a richly textured coherence but his constant emphasis on visual impact, clear story telling and performance opportunities compensate for the comparative weakness of the dialogue. A grand processional entry in typically Fieldian manner occurs in



the second act of *The Fatal Dowry*.

*Enter Funerall. Body borne by 4 Captaines and Souldiers.  
Mourners. Scutchions and very good order. Charalois and  
Romont meet it. Charalois speaks, Romont weeping. Solemne  
Musique...*

*(Fatal Dowry, 1632, D2r; II.1.47 SD)*

Charalois comments on his own performance as a son mourning his father in language which, progressively, draws attention to the theatrical spectacle he presents:

How like a silent streame shaded with night,  
And gliding softly with our windy sighes  
Moves the whole frame of this solemnity!  
Teares, sighes and blackes, filling the simily,  
Whilst I the onely murmur in this groue  
Of death, thus hollowly break forth!

*(Fatal Dowry, II.1.48)*

He silences an interruption later

Peace, O peace, this sceane is wholly mine.<sup>5</sup>

*(Fatal Dowry, II.1.73)*

Charalois's playing metaphor here does not seem to me to be making only the commonplace comparison between life and the stage but rather to be creating a self-reflexive discontinuity whereby the audience's attention is redirected to the player's delivery and the impressive nature of the visual image he presents. Since the verse's quality is somewhat suspect the danger for a bad actor is obvious. But yet the emotional power of this sentimental scene reinforced by the 'solemne musique', could be very considerable.

Even the most skilful actor might find it difficult to make anything of

an episode in *The Queen of Corinth* but the bathos of the dialogue is well disguised by the excitement of the duel and the blood flowing freely on all sides. At a moment of crisis two brothers are reconciled as one lies wounded:

*Euph.* ...in humility

I give ye the duty of a younger Brother,  
Which take you as a Brother, not a Father,  
And then you'll pay a duty back to me.

*Cra.* Till now I have not wept these thirty yeares.

*Euph.* Discording Brothers, are like mutuall leggs  
Supplanting one another: he that seekes  
Aid from a stranger and forsakes his Brother,  
Do's but like him that madly lops his arme,  
And to his body joynes a wooden one:  
Cuts off his naturall legge, and trusts a Crutch,  
Plucks out his eyes to see with Spectacles.

*Cra.* Most deare *Euphanes*, In this crimson cloud  
Wash my unkindnesse out...

(*Queen of Corinth*, pp.18-19; Waller, IV.3, p.63)

Field here shows much more assurance visually than verbally. The writing is frankly inept, but he is confident in what can be done and shown on stage.

This is exemplified by a scene from 'Love' when Dorothea explains that she has replaced poison by 'meer Opium' and that Ferdinand and Violanta are not dead but merely asleep. On the page the scene seems weak, its structure clumsy, its dialogue worse than perfunctory, its handling of rhyme verging dangerously on the comic.

Musick, gently creep  
Into their ears, and fight hence lazy sleep.  
*Morpheus*, command they servant sleep  
In leaden chains no longer keep  
This Prince and Lady: Rise, wake, rise,  
And round about convey your eyes:  
Rise Prince, go greet thy Father and thy Mother;  
Rise thou, t'imbrace thy Husand and thy Brother.

*Duke Cor.* Son, Daughter.

*Ferd.* Father, Mother, Brother.



Ger.            Wife.  
Viol.          Are we not all in heaven?

(*Four Plays, 'Love', p.39; Waller, p.333*)

As in the recognition scene at the end of *A Woman is a Weathercock*, skeletal dialogue needs fleshing out by players and musicians as the complex patterned movements implied by Dorothea's comments are put into staged action. Players supply living emotion not immediately apparent in the language of the scene. The dialogue is supported by the musical accompaniment.

The logical conclusion of Field's fondness for visual effects to parallel or replace dialogue is the dumbshow, and these are frequent in his work. Sometimes these are demanded by his practical stagecraft as in the mimed interlude that opens the last scene of *A Woman is a Weathercock*. This provides moments of visual comedy appropriate to situation and character, but is there for pragmatic reasons. Verbal description moves into action here to cover the setting up of the final scene.

*...they seate themselves, Lady Ninnie offers at two or three  
chaires; at last finds the great one: they point at her, and laugh.  
As soone as she is set, she drinks of hir bottle...*

(*Weathercock, V.2.4*)

For the player of Lady Ninny, with only ten lines in the whole play, this episode gives further opportunity for comedy entirely appropriate to someone with the splendid drunk scene after the wedding, and who is described by Pouts as 'a blacke Bumbarde with a pint pot waiting upon it'.

Dieter Mehl has demonstrated how useful dumbshows are in allowing lengthy narratives to be compressed into convenient stage form, and he suggests that all three dumbshows in 'Love' have this function. He argues

that their form is dictated by the playwright's experiments with tragicomedy.

In condensed form the play contains all the important features of this new genre, and it is interesting to see that it is precisely here, where only little time is available for the unfolding of a complicated love story, that the pantomimes become a technical aid. Only with the help of three dumbshows can the whole plot be compressed into such a brief play.<sup>6</sup>

This is true of the second dumbshow where several new items vital to an understanding of the plot are introduced. Chief of these is the restoration of the usurped Duke Rinaldo.

Enter Duke *Rinaldo* with attendants, at one door; States, *Randulpho* and *Gerrard*, at another: they kneel to the Duke; he accepts their obedience, and raises them up: they prefer *Gerrard* to the Duke, who entertains him: they seat the Duke in State...

(*Four Plays, 'Love'*, p.36; Waller, p.326)

After a lengthy central section which involves Ferdinand's betrayal of Gerrard, Cornelia's intervention and Gerrard's arrest, the dumbshow continues.

Enter *Dorothea* with a Cup: weeping she delivers it to *Ferd.* who with discontent *exit*; and *Exeunt Benvoglio* and *Dorothea*.

(*Four Plays, 'Love'*, p.36; Waller, p.326)

The narrative content is dense. The cup, a vital plot element, is not explained by any dialogue. The story must be read from the spectacle alone. This dumbshow, unlike similar ones in *Pericles*, has no presenter to explain it. Neither can it be regarded as an interlude to which necessary but



uninteresting plot materials are relegated, while more important things happen in scenes with dialogue. Each of the dumbshow's elements is an essential plot component, economically presented through actions and not words. So far, then, I agree with Dieter Mehl. The first dumbshow is different. It has a similarly packed narrative content but on this occasion the lengthy dumbshow parallels and reinforces plot elements already known to the spectators. There is no new information. We already know from the dialogue exactly what has to happen.

...wills you to attend her this evening at the back gate; I'll let you in; where her own Confessor shall put you together lawfully ere the childe be born; which birth is very neere I can assure you: all your charge is your vigilance; and to bring with you some trustie Nurse, to convey the infant out of the house.

(*Four Plays, 'Love'*, p.34; Waller, p.320)

There are further lengthy instructions to Violanta and others and then we have the dumbshow.

*Angelina* sends *Dorothea* for *Gerrard*. Enter *Gerrard* with *Dorothea*: *Angelina* and *Cornelia* seem to chide him shewing *Violanta*'s heavy plight: *Violanta* rejoyceth in him: he makes signes of sorrow, intreating pardon: *Angelina* brings *Gerrard* and *Violanta* to the Frier; he joyns them hand in hand, takes a Ring from *Gerrard*, puts it on *Violanta*'s finger; blesseth them, *Gerrard* kisseth her: the Frier takes his leave. *Violanta* makes shew of great pain, is instantly conveyed in by the women, *Gerrard* is bid stay; he walks in meditation, seeming to pray. Enter *Dorothea*, whispers him, sends him out. Enter *Gerrard* with a Nurse blindfold: gives her a purse. To them enter *Angelina* and *Cornelia* with an infant; they present it to *Gerrard*; he kisseth it and blesseth it; puts it into the Nurses arms, kneels, and takes his leave. *Exeunt* all severally.

(*Four Plays, 'Love'*, p.35; Waller, p.321)

There are advantages in the way that this long dumbshow opens out the

narrative. Plot condensation is, as Mehl indicates, certainly one. The wedding ceremony and Violanta's labour are compressed non-naturalistically into a few ritual moments. One has only to compare the clumsy comedy of the scene in *The Duchess of Malfi* where Antonio similarly awaits news of his Duchess's successful labour to realise that Field's solution is an elegant one.<sup>7</sup> In this dumbshow, too, relationships are clearly indicated. The pantomime has been carefully prepared for in the dialogue so concentration falls on the emotions of the characters, indicated in broad gestural outlines - 'seem to chide him', 'make signs of sorrow' '...rejoyceth in him' and so on. The repetition of events renders them clear and memorable. Yet the presentational technique deflects involvement and disturbs the empathetic relationship with the protagonists built up in the earlier dialogue scenes. The dumbshow aids the clarity and the story telling but does not help spectators' involvement. Realism and dumbshow stand in uneasy juxtaposition. So this dumbshow is perhaps a less successful 'technical aid' than Mehl indicates. The third dumbshow is not really a dumbshow at all, but more a processional entry and on this occasion there is no saving of time. Its motive is quite different. Tension and atmosphere appropriate to the solemnity of the occasion are prepared for by the long and detailed entry. The actors are carefully grouped so that maximum impact is given to the shocking sight of the young lovers apparently dead. Music heightens the moment.

*Soft Musick*

*Enter Angelina with the bodies of Ferdinand and Violanta on a bier; Dorothea carrying the cup and letter, which she gives to the Duke: he reads, seem sorrowful...*

*(Four Plays, 'Love', p.38; Waller, p.333)*



As the short play reaches its climax words seem to be superfluous: even where the characters do speak their speeches are, as I discussed earlier, very brief. Again, confident handling of stage action overrides the use of dialogue.

In *The Queen of Corinth* Field again sets a dumbshow at the heart of the play, and shapes the dialogue to frame the visual enactment of the play's central concern. The plot materials could have been handled in a number of different ways, the most economical being a brief description of events reported by two anonymous gentlemen. But Field opts for a grand set piece in which Euphanes's triumph and his power over the Queen are fully enacted. The moment is anticipated in the framing dialogue.

The Queene (my Lord) perplex'd in care of you,  
That crosse to her command, hazard your selfe  
In person, here is come into the Field,  
And like a Leader, marches in the head  
Of all her Troopes...

(*Queen of Corinth*, p.17; Waller, IV.3, p.59)

We see Agenor and Leonidas surrender to Euphanes in a scene whose emblematic content I referred to earlier. The drum sounds and the dumbshow follows immediately after Leonidas's speech emphasising the significance of their capture.

*Enter (at one Doore) Queen, Theonor, Crates, Conon, Lords, Souldiers, (at another) Euphanes (with two swords) Agenor, Leonidas, Souldiers: Euphanes presents Leonidas on his knees to the Queen: Agenor bare-headed, makes shew of sorrow to the Queen, she stamps and seemes to be angry at the first. Euphanes perswades her, layes their swords at her feet, she kisses him, gives them their swords againe, they kisse her hand and embrace, the Souldiers lift up Euphanes, and shout...*

(*Queen of Corinth*, p.18; Waller IV.3, p.60)

This is a curious sequence. Earlier in the act the audience has, like Leonidas and Agenor, been gripped by Euphanes's golden words. Despite opportunities offered by the plot for a stage battle, Field's handling of the confrontation with the rebels relegates armies to off stage. Euphanes's persuasive language is his only weapon as he 'thrusts' himself 'defenceless' before them. It is a moment in which all the rhetorical skills of the actor are most exposed. And yet the reconciliation scene is carried out without a word spoken - except for the shouts of the soldiers as they lift the victorious Euphanes at the end of the scene.

Of course it is not quite the end of the dumbshow for the directions continue very oddly.

*...Theanor and Crates discovered, Conon whispers with Crates; Euphanes with Agenor, and Leonidas observes it, who seeme to promise something, Euphanes directs his page somewhat.*

*(Queen of Corinth, p.18; Waller, IV.3, p.60)*

After the visual clarity of the first part of the dumbshow this is strangely imprecise. There is no entry for the page and 'directs his page somewhat' and 'seeme to promise something' are less useful as explicit instructions to actors than earlier directions have been. This dumbshow in *The Queen of Corinth* is not entirely successful, for the uneasy juxtaposition of spectacle and speech makes the whole scene tonally confusing and incoherent. Yet perhaps spectators would find the shift from one mode to another interesting in the variety it provides, and might appreciate its visual impact.

*The Knight of Malta* is more successful. Spectacle in this play is intrinsic and allows Field to solve problems of narrative technique whilst exploiting his interest in ritual and ceremony. The island is a meeting place of national stereotypes and offers exciting costume and make-up possibilities



but visual effects are more deeply woven into the play's texture than these surface elements, complementing and not replacing words.

The play's structure rests on three of the ceremonies of the Knights of Malta; the meeting of the 'conventicle' for the proposed investiture of Gomera and Miranda, at which Mountferrat accuses Oriana, her consequent trial before the assembled knights and the last meeting of the 'auberge' for the 'degrading' of Mountferrat and the investiture of Miranda. In addition the audience is constantly reminded of the Order throughout the play. Astorius and Castriot, for example, suitably robed, ensure that the values the Order stands for are continually present. 'The Cross of Malta...true sign of holiness' plays an essential part in Lucinda's testing, and Mountferrat's self hatred.

The Order of Knights is essential for each strand of the plot. The success of the counterfeit letter, the arrival of Lucinda and Norandine's wounds all result from the Knights' battle with the Turks. Almost all the main characters are members of the Order and Miranda's conflict between love and honour, the keystone of the Oriana, Gomera plot is similarly centred on it. His vow of chastity is crucial. Miranda's actions and his protection of Oriana are only understandable in relation to his vows, and coherence is given to a collaborative play by Field's handling of the ceremonial sections. In Fletcher's sections of the play the eventual outcome expected by the audience is the union of Miranda and Oriana, despite his vows and Oriana's marriage to Gomera. At the end of the play, however, Gomera and Oriana are lovingly reconciled through Miranda's agency, and Miranda enters the Order whose standards one realises retrospectively he has been upholding throughout. The ceremonies of the Order have to be fully realised so that Miranda's decision does not come as an anticlimax, breaking the back of the play. Structural as well as thematic unity is achieved by framing the action in two long ceremonies.

In the opening act of the play Miranda is offered all the trappings of the Order of the Knights of St John.

Our sacred Robe of Knight-hood, our white Crosse,  
The holy cognizance of him we serve,  
The sword, the spurrs...

(*Knight of Malta*, pp.73-4; Waller, II.3, p.88)

but he refuses. Not until the end of the play does the full ceremony take place. On the same occasion the evil Mountferrat is degraded.

*An altar discovered, with Tapers, and a Book on it. The two Bishops stand on each side of it; Mountferrat as the Song is singing, ascends up the altar.*

(*Knight of Malta*, p.95; Waller, V.2, p.161)

The ceremony of degradation proceeds. The actions of the Esguard who performs it can be readily inferred from his words.

Using th' authority th' Superiour  
Hath given unto me, I unty this knot,  
And take from thee the pleasing yoak of heaven:  
We take from off thy breast this holy crosse,  
Which thou hast made thy burthen, not thy prop;  
Thy spurs we spoile thee off, cleaving thy heeles  
Bare of thy honour, that have kick'd against  
Our orders precepts: next we reave thy sword,  
And give thee armlesse to thy enemies,  
For being foe to goodnesse, and to God,  
Last, 'bout thy stiff neck, we this halter hang,  
And leave thee to the mercy of the Court.

(*Knight of Malta*, p.95; Waller V.2, pp.161-2)

At first the investiture of Miranda follows a similar pattern. Like Mountferrat he ascends the altar accompanied by a song relating his actions



and the appropriateness of his reward. Like Mountferrat he is concerned, though in reverse order, with sword, spurs, cross and cloak. Yet where Mountferrat performs his part in silence the ceremony demands that Miranda engages in dialogue with the two Bishops, and that he should take a vow.

I vow henceforth a chaste life, not to enjoy  
Any thing proper to myself; obedience  
To my superiours, whom Religion,  
And Heaven shall give me: ever to defend  
The vertuous fame of Ladies, and to oppugne  
Even unto death the Christian enemy,  
This do I vow to accomplish.

(*Knight of Malta*, p.95; Waller, V.2, p.162)

We can see from Field's handling of the source material from which these ceremonies are taken how his practical actor-dramatist's mind works. I think Brock is wrong to suggest that he varied from *Statuta Hospitalis Hierusalem* 'only by condensing it and by making modifications necessary to turn Latin prose into English verse' (Brock, p.liv). He is very selective, taking only those elements that are practical to achieve - the altar, the taper, the impressively costumed figure of the Esguard. To these he adds very clear theatrical signals of his own. Spurs, sword and halter do not appear in the order book, but make Mountferrat's degradation instantly readable by the spectators. As well as these visual additions, Field extends the ceremony by adding dialogue to emphasise the virtue of Miranda. His promise 'ever to defend the virtuous fame of ladies' is not in the source yet neatly clarifies Miranda's motives and makes the happy ending of this tragi-comedy more acceptable. Field's use of ceremony in the last act of *The Knight of Malta* fuses speech, music, props, costume and movement into a fitting climax for a

play whose theme is chastity and whose setting is the exotic island of Malta.

Ceremonial functions in Field's work are frequently fulfilled by music. Paired songs accompany the degrading of Mountferrat and the investiture of Miranda and the words of these songs leave no room for doubt of their place in the story.

Off with his Roab, expell him forth this place,  
Whilst we rejoyce, and sing at his disgrace

(*Knight of Malta*, p.95; Waller, V.2, p.161)

in the first song is balanced by

As this flame mounts, so mount thy zeale, thy glory  
Rise past the Stars and fix in Heaven thy story.

(*Knight of Malta*, p.95; Waller, V.2, p.162)

The words of the song are reinforced emblematically. To the visual splendour of the conventicle is added the extra colour of music and song. At the same time the music has an essentially practical function, covering the drawing of the curtain in front of the altar, and Mountferrat's ascent. Field's stagecraft here usefully combines practicality and symbolism.

At many important moments in his play and scenes Field trusts to spectacle, sound and silence rather than spoken dialogue. It is therefore easy to undervalue his stagecraft since we can only infer the power of these presentational moments from the surviving scripts. The problem is even more acute with the plays' music, now quite inaccessible to us. Yet music is fundamental. It is one of the most significant factors in Field's dramaturgy. All the plays with which he is associated include extensive music cues. At Blackfriars where Field spent his formative years as a player, music was an important part of the entertainment on offer. The instrumental music and



exquisite singing of the boys' company were notable.<sup>8</sup> Music and song accompany the ritual and ceremonial set pieces I have been discussing. 'Loud', 'soft', 'solemn' or 'tun'd' music all help to create atmospheres appropriate to Field's story according to established theatrical convention.<sup>9</sup> Songs convey information, evoke sympathy or characterize their singers.

Music signals the approach of the wedding festivities in *A Woman is a Weathercock* and thus, conveniently, provides music for the act. At the same time laughter is generated as Sir Abraham's ridiculous posturings are comically undercut by the juxtaposition of somebody else's wedding music with his own ludicrous lament.

...There pine and die, poore, poore Sir *Abram*.  
*Om.* Oh dolefull dumpe. *Musicke playes*.  
*World.* Nay you shall stay the wedding, Hark the Musick,  
Your Bride is readie.  
*Count.* Put Spirit in your Fingers; Lowder still,  
And the vast Ayre with your enchantments fill.  
*Exeunt Om.*  
(*Weathercock*, I.2, 392)

A more serious contrast in mood is provided by wedding music in the following act where Scudmore, another rejected lover, questions

Oh, why should Musicke, which joyes everie part,  
Strike such sharpe killing discords to my hart?  
(*Weathercock*, II.1, 114)

'A Boy singes to the tun'd Musicke' as the wedding procession moves softly round the stage. 'Loud Musicke' accompanies their re-entry 'as from the Church', as the celebrations continue. 'Musicke' plays throughout the opening of III.2 of *Weathercock* and, with the 'Table napkins...wine, Plate

*Tobacco and pipes* establishes a locale and atmosphere. 'Hoboyes', essential contributors to 'loud Musicke', serve a similar function in *The Fatal Dowry*. Field is clearly calling on his practical experience of the convention here: there is no need for him to make '&c.' explicit.

*Here a passage over the Stage, while the Act is playing for the Marriage of Charalois with Beaumelle. &c.*

*(Fatal Dowry, II.2, 360)*

Usefully, too, the interval 'while the Act is playing' allows the passage of sufficient time for the marriage to be consummated, while the audience is prepared for a change of pace and mood.

Not all music is celebratory. Where 'loud Musicke' is appropriate for a party, 'soft Musick' is needed for the funeral procession in *Four Plays*, 'Love' (p.38; Waller, p.333). In *The Queen of Corinth* sympathy is evoked for Merione's grief with 'A sad song' but as Agenor points out

There heavie Ayres feed sorrow in her Lady,  
And nourish it too strongly...

*(Queen of Corinth, p.13; Waller, III.2, p.45)*

Beliza therefore orders 'some lighter note' and a second song is sung (*Queen of Corinth*, p.13; Waller, III.2, p.45). These contrasting songs reflect Merione's desperate state of mind and the happiness her friends wish for her. At the same time they prepare the way for the love scene that follows by a gentle lightning of the tone.

Paired songs preface Charalois' discovery of his wife's adultery in *The Fatal Dowry*. Earlier in the same play Aymour's song has emphasised the sensual attraction of the lovers in his 'Dialogue between Novall and



Beaumelle'. The overt sexuality of the closing couplet

*Woman* Yet this out-savours wine, and this Perfume.

*Man* Let's die, I languish, I consume.

(*Fatal Dowry*, II.2.135)

is thematically relevant, as well as establishing the relaxed hedonistic atmosphere that surrounds Novall and Beaumelle.

Sympathy for Charalois is created by the skilful use of music, and the sound effect usefully signals the seriousness of the occasion.

*Enter Funerall. Body borne by 4. Captaines and Souldiers. Mourners, Scutchions, and very good order...Charalois speaks, Romont weeping. Solemn Musique...*

(*Fatal Dowry*, II.1.48 SD)

A marginal note indicates that the 'Solemne Musique' was supplied by recorders. After a moving scene in which Charalois bestows 'a few poore legacyes' there is more 'Musicke' - this time a song.

Though I agree with Philip Edwards that this is 'singularly inappropriate' for a funeral I think it has more relevance in the full context of the scene than he supposes (Edwards, note on lines 133-8, V, p.100). He suggests that it would be 'better addressed to a hard-hearted mistress' but there is surely dramatic point in a song like this being addressed to hard-hearted creditors. A similar point is made earlier in the scene when Charalois comments that even the creditors are moved to tears by his predicament. This has taken the same sort of miracle that the song proposes.

Ha, let me see, my miracle is eas'd,  
The Jaylors and the creditors do weepe.  
Even they that make us weepe, do weepe themselves.

(*Fatal Dowry*, II.1.75)

As the song forms a link between Charalois and the cruelty of the creditors it

seems quite well placed here. Certainly our sympathy for Charalois is increased.

The inclusion of masques and dances as essential plot elements of *A Woman is a Weathercock* and *The Faithful Friends* means that music is crucially important in these two plays.<sup>10</sup> In *A Woman is a Weathercock* stages of plot development are marked by the change from 'loud' to 'softe' music, an aural indication of the formally patterned end to the play. Music and dance dictates the shaping of the scene in a practical way as the stage groupings are controlled by the measures of the dance. It is a skilful way of manipulating the very large numbers of people who are required for the plot denouement. Movements are organised and formal as the resolution depends on the changes of partner.

Field uses music to cover time intervals, to change location and to redirect the interest of the spectators to a different thread of the plot. This is best illustrated by the song in Act Four of *Amends for Ladies* which Subtle intends for the Wife. This is set within a sequence of events which begins with

*Enter WIDOW undrest, a sword in her hand, and BOULD in his shirt, as started from bed.*

*(Amends, IV.1.1)*

The scene is, temporally, virtually continuous with III.3 where Bould, throwing off his disguise goes into the Widow's chamber to join her in bed. In this scene he asks her

...Consider Lady,  
That little, but blest time, I was in bed,  
Although I lay as by my sisters side

...

*(Amends, IV.1.18)*

They are clearly inside the Widow's house since, after his rejection, Bould



pleads

Let me but tarrie till the morning Madam,  
To send for clothes, shall I goe naked home?  
*Widow* Tis best time now, it is but one o'clock,  
And you may goe unseene.

(*Amends*, IV.1.127)

After seven more lines the Widow exits and for a further four lines Bould soliloquises. His reflection on his difficult condition is interrupted

Faith she has turn'd me out of her service verie barely,  
harke, whats heere, musique.  
*Enter SUBTLE with a paper and his BOY with a cloake.*

(*Amends*, IV.1.142)

The boy sings the song after Subtle has read the words through carefully first.

This device, less clumsy than many, ensures that the spectators hear the words clearly, important since they both relocalize and retime the stage.

*Subtle* Rise Ladie Mistresse rise:  
The night hath tedious beene  
...  
All want day till thy beautie rise,  
For the graie morne breaks from thine eyes.  
Now sing it sirrha [*The Song sung by the BOY*]

(*Amends*, IV.2.145.155)

When Subtle challenges Bold with being 'an early stirrer' he explains that 'I have been up all night at dice, & lost my clothes' (*Amends*, IV.2.166). Presumably it is at this point that the Boy gives him the cloak mentioned in the stage direction, and he then exits. The serenade, then, is integral in controlling plot and chronology, besides providing opportunity for some attractive singing.

While Field's work is very dependent upon music it makes surprisingly little use of other sound cues. There are no alarums and excursions, no 'ordnance shot off' even in the plays with a military setting. '*Drums, Trumpets, Colours*' and *Drums and Colours* (*Four Plays*, 'Honour', p.26, p.31; Waller, p.293, p.309) are rare exceptions. There is a call for thunder in both the 'plotte' for and the written up scene of IV.5 in *The Faithful Friends*. Hoofbeats could enhance a scene in *The Queen of Corinth*.<sup>11</sup> Offstage voices establish a bowling alley, a fight, and an offstage crowd.<sup>12</sup> The extradramatic Induction of *Four Plays* starts with *Noise within*, presumably both real and fictional, as Field manipulates a metatheatrical effect by using the real circumstances of a play's opening. All of these effects can be easily achieved by the players and musicians. There are no extraordinary demands.

In the examples I have discussed in this chapter one can see Field, more or less successfully, making visual those things which might otherwise have remained verbal, converting the 'linguistic texture of utterance' into the 'dramatic texture of action'.<sup>13</sup> At the same time the spectators are constantly entertained by displays of skill and ceremonial. At its most skilful Field's art allows the interaction of dramatic presentation, music and verbal imagery, as spectacle and speech combine to create 'speaking pictures'. Occasionally he falters but his old-fashioned staging techniques like extravagant processional entries, dumbshows and over-explicit emblems have compensations. Music is one of these. One is always aware of the constant theatricality of his work; of his belief in the story and his confidence in the skills of the players who come onto the stage to present it to the spectators. At its best Field's spectacle is both 'entertaining' and 'significant', though it is rarely silent.



## NOTES

1. Ben Jonson, *Volpone*, edited by Philip Brockbank, New Mermaid (London, 1968), p.xxv.
2. See for example, Henry Green, *Shakespeare and the Emblem Writers: An exposition of their similarities of Thought and Expression* (London, 1870); Dieter Mehl, 'Emblems in English Renaissance Drama', *Renaissance Drama*, ns 2 (1969), 39-57; Inga-Stina Ewbank, '"More pregnantly than words." Some uses and limitations of visual symbolism', *Shakespeare Survey*, 24 (1971), 13-18; Dieter Mehl, 'Visual and Rhetorical Imagery in Shakespeare's Plays', *Essays and Studies*, ns.25 (1972), 83-100; John Reibetanz, 'Theatrical Emblems in *King Lear*', in *Some Facets of King Lear: essays in Prismatic Criticism*, edited by Rosalie L.Colie and F.T.Flahiff (Toronto and London, 1974), pp.39-57; Ralph Berry, 'Masques and Dumbshows in Webster's Plays', in *Elizabethan Theatre*, VII, edited by George Hibbard (Waterloo, 1981), pp.124-146; Marion Lomax, *Stage Images and Traditions: Shakespeare to Ford* (London, 1987).
3. Peter Thomson, *Shakespeare's Theatre* (London, 1983) p.45.
4. For a full discussion of visual stage conventions see also Barbara A.Mowat, '"The Getting Up of the Spectacle": the Role of the Visual on the Elizabethan Stage, 1576-1600', in *Elizabethan Theatre*, IX, edited by George Hibbard (Waterloo, 1981), pp.60-76 and G.K.Hunter, 'Flatcaps and Bluecoats: Visual signals on the Elizabethan Stage', *Essays and Studies*, ns 33 (1980), 16-47.
5. The popularity of this stage device continues right up to this century. In Noel Coward's *Present Laughter*, for example, Garry Essendine has similar objections to being interrupted in mid-flow.

Garry     "We meet not as we parted  
 ...  
 Daphne   But, Garry -  
 Garry     Be quiet for a minute, darling -  
              "That moment from time was singled  
 ...

Noel Coward, *Present Laughter* in *Plays: Four*, The Master Playwrights (London, 1979), pp.133-247 (p.147).

6. Dieter Mehl, *The Elizabethan Dumbshow: A History of a Dramatic Convention* (London, 1965), p.163.



7. John Webster, *The Duchess of Malfi*, edited by John Russell Brown, *The Revels Plays* (London, 1964), II.2.
8. Evidence is provided by Burbage's comments in the Induction to *The Malcontent* added on the play's transfer from the boys' company to the adult King's Men, and the visit of Frederic Gerschow to Blackfriars in 1602. John Marston, *The Malcontent*, edited by G.K.Hunter, *The Revels Plays* (London, 1975), Induction, 81-84; *Diary of Frederic Gerschow*, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, ns 6 (1892), 26-8; Andrew Gurr, *Playgoing in Shakespeare's London* (Cambridge, 1987), p.195; Reavley Gair, 'Take over at Blackfriars: Queen's Revels to King's Men', in *Elizabethan Theatre*, X, edited by C.E.McGee (Waterloo, 1988), pp.37-54.
9. For a full discussion of these terms see J.S.Manifold, *Music in English Drama from Shakespeare to Purcell* (London, 1956). Hautboys are used to provide 'loud musicke' for 'hospitality, entertainments and weddings' (p.89); 'soft' music is 'probably' strings (p.93); 'solemn;' music often means the organ, with, perhaps, the voice (pp.95-96). Recorders are frequently associated with mystery and death (p.68).
10. Alan Brissenden discusses Elizabethan conventions about dance in *Shakespeare and the Dance* (London, 1981).
11. The thunder was probably provided by a drum or drums as it was at the Fortune. In *Astrologaster* John Melton tells of a performance there sometime before 1620: 'a man may behold shagge-hayr'd Deuills runne roaring over the Stage with squibs in their mouthes, while Drummers make Thunder in the Tying-house'. Cited by R.B.Graves, 'Elizabethan Lighting Effects and the Conventions of Indoor and Outdoor Theatrical Illuminations', *Renaissance Drama*, ns 12 (1981), 51-69 (p.65). Frances Shirley gives details of a range of Elizabethan stage sound effects in *Shakespeare's Use of Off Stage Sounds* (Lincoln, Nebraska, 1963).
12. *Weathercock* III.3.5; *Honest Man's Fortune*, p.156; *Waller*, II.1.p.226; *Weathercock*, V.1.91-2.
13. Marjorie Garber, 'Cymbeline and the language of myth', *Mosaic*, 10 (1977), 105, cited by Marion Lomax, p.34.



## CHAPTER 11: Players and Spectators

In looking at Field's work in terms of the theatre resources available to him I concluded that he had a player's awareness of their advantages and disadvantages and exploited them accordingly in his play texts. I also examined the ways in which the visual and the non verbal are fundamental to Field's dramaturgy. His plays are theatre shows offering players numerous opportunities for showing a range of skills. This chapter explores that other prerequisite of performance - the presence of an audience. In Field's work the relationship between the three elements of drama's 'triple bond' is particularly active. Reading his plays one is kept constantly aware of just how important the spectators are to Field in determining the strategies he uses in creating his performance texts.

You don't understand the humiliation of it - to be tricked out of the single assumption which makes our existence viable - that somebody is *watching* ... We're actors ... We pledged our identities, secure in the conventions of our trade; that someone would be watching. And then gradually, no one was...<sup>1</sup>

The player's predicament in *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead* aptly epitomises Field's concern as a playwright. One may infer from the surviving material that his writing is informed by the same impulse as his playing: to please his audience. After all, without an audience there can be no play.<sup>2</sup>

The aim of many of Field's dramatic techniques is, then, to make the spectators aware of their responsibilities towards the shared enterprise in the playhouse. Field in his writing assumes an active audience who, whilst becoming involved in the play's fictions, will also respond to the players as players.

Keir Elam has written of the 'peculiar obliqueness of the actor-audience relationship' which is the result of



the fact that performer-audience communication does not (except in the case of prologues, epilogues, asides and apostrophes) take a direct form: the actor-spectator transaction within the theatrical context is mediated by a dramatic context in which a fictional speaker addresses a fictional listener.<sup>3</sup>

Field renders the relationship less oblique. He does this in two ways. First, he makes extensive use of the devices Elam relegates to parenthesis: prologues, asides and direct address are important factors in his dramaturgy. Field, far beyond the conventional, writes to make patent the theatrical contexts common to players and spectators. His insistence that 'this is only a play' reinforces the bonds between spectators and players as they all become willing and active participants in a shared enterprise. Field flatters his audience with a sense of privilege, appealing to their theatrical experience and sophistication. To this end he celebrates theatrical conventions while simultaneously undercutting them.

Second, Field involves spectators in his plays by ensuring easy comprehension and a sense of familiarity. He is a comfortable writer. Plots are predictable. Challenges in subject matter and theme are few. The tone is usually genial. Conventional moral values are endorsed rather than questioned. His plays and scenes are peopled with stock characters, which move beyond stereotype in the mode of their presentation but are still readily recognisable as conventional figures. Field is also careful to make details of his story very clear. Appellations and entrance announcements, recapitulations, explanatory asides - all these ensure that the spectators are not discomfited by a lack of narrative clarity. They can be drawn into and assent to the play's fiction because it is what they recognise and accept.

There are, therefore, two simultaneous movements in Field's plays and scenes, one towards the audience's detachment from the fiction and one



towards its engagement with it.<sup>4</sup> This distinction is partly an artificial one since even the simplest act of theatre sets up a complex set of responses as S.L.Bethell's pioneering work makes plain.<sup>5</sup> It is the simultaneity of the two tendencies that is significant. One might expect the fabric of plays and scenes to be torn apart by the tensions created by contrary movements towards engagement and detachment but in fact the opposite is the case. The weighting of the balance in favour of the spectators unifies Field's work: his concern is always to welcome, to acknowledge and to use his audience. This is the player's instinct. Trevor Nunn, discussing the dictates of the Swan Theatre, a venue reminiscent of the Jacobean Theatre, and its effect on playing styles writes

...[it] is a public space, which has to be addressed, projected into, assailed and I fear that when people use it at a lower level of energy, it won't work at all. Introspection contradicts the rules of the space and the dynamics of it. Because the bulk of the audience is both surrounding and above the action, then the form of address must be outward and upward. It cannot be an address based on the idea that the audience isn't there. It can *only* be based on the acceptance that they *are* there, and they are welcome, that they are in some sense involved, they are acknowledged and used. They're not looking through a key-hole, not voyeurs - they haven't crept into a real event.<sup>6</sup>

The qualities Nunn describes - energy, extroversion, attack and the needs he articulates to welcome, acknowledge, and use the spectators are fundamental characteristics of Field's plays and scenes. In forging bonds between isolated spectators and individual players Field has a difficult task. As Ralph Berry reminds us:

The audience is an external puzzle, even when we are part of it. What the audience is, no man knows. It has assembled for a single occasion and will never meet again. Even so the playwright knows or guesses something of it. He must have a strategy for bringing this curious multiple into a union of sorts.



He must, like an actor...play to all parts of the house, so as to induce in them their share of the common experience.<sup>7</sup>

In what follows I have isolated one tendency from the other so that strategies of 'detachment' precede those of 'engagement'. Some distortions, repetition and oversimplification are the inevitable result.

(i)

In building the relationship between players and spectators Field uses a wide range of reference to the contemporary theatre scene, and is continually playful about the theatre itself and the role of the actors in the playhouse. Field's characters within the world of the play draw attention to their theatrical as well as their dramatic reality. Such effects are a commonplace of the Elizabethan theatre as Anne Richter has amply demonstrated.<sup>8</sup> She has shown that players, associated with dreams and shadows, are symbols 'of that which is illusory and insubstantial' (Richter, p.203). According to the Elizabethan convention she establishes so fully, notes sounded within the 'reality' of the playworld that the audience are watching a play serve to

remind the audience that elements of illusion are present in ordinary life, and that between the world and the stage there exists a complicated interplay of resemblance that is part of the perfection and nobility of the drama itself as a form.

(Richter, p.86)

John Edmunds, more recently, makes a similar point in discussing Shakespeare's breaking of dramatic illusion. After considering Fabian, Cleopatra and Portia he comments

All the examples I have cited involve characters changing their role from actor to observer, or observing themselves playing a rôle in a situation the audience has been lulled into accepting as real, thus obliquely drawing their attention to their own rôle for the nonce as observers, and so to rôle playing in real life.<sup>9</sup>

Later he adds that Shakespeare breaks the illusion to underline 'qualities of drama as myth, ritual and rôle playing' (p.40). Field has a less elevated intention. Far from being symbolic, his players remain defiantly themselves, whilst their spectators share an enjoyable fiction whose rules are known and whose conditions all acknowledge. There is a conscious mutual recognition that the spectators are aware of lending their credulity. They are simultaneously encouraged to become involved with events on stage. Direct address, asides and soliloquies create an extra-dramatic rapport as spectators are let into secrets, asked to bear witness to the accuracy, or otherwise, of judgments, and, perhaps most of all, invited to admire the performances they share.

There are no appeals in Field to the audience to use its imagination or to believe in the 'reality' of the stage action. The only Induction Field writes deliberately emphasises the theatrical nature of the performances to follow by providing them with an audience onstage, and with further prologues to each piece. Don Frigoso opens the entertainment by preventing unwanted people from attending.

Away with those bald pated Rascals there, their wits are bound up in Vellum, they are not currant here. Down with those City-Gentlemen, &c. Out with those – I say, and in with their wives at the back-door.

(*Four Plays*, 'Induction', p.25; Waller, p.289)

The permissive '&c' here presumably offers the actor playing Frigoso the



opportunity to include any other topical groups likely to amuse and flatter his audience. Frigoso chides Rinaldo who has come in search of a seat at the entertainment.

...would you had come sooner: you see how full the Scaffolds  
are, there is scant room for a lovers thought here.  
Gentlewomen sit close for shame: Has none of ye a little corner  
for this Gentleman? I'll place ye, fear not.

(*Four Plays*, Induction, p.25; Waller, p.290)

The player of Frigoso here makes direct contact with the spectators on the 'scaffold'. At the same time he is made an object of ridicule. With inflated rhetoric he boosts his own self importance and denies all knowledge of Rinaldo: 'This very talking with you is a bad example'. This is usefully preparatory for what follows as the Poet's Prologue and the intermeans welcome, flatter and make apologies to their audiences, those without as much as those within the fiction. Field's spectators, like the King and Queen in the Induction, can make 'excellent use' of a play. Potential criticism is averted.

what hurt's now in a Play, against which some rail  
so vehemently? thou and I, my Love,  
make excellent use methinks: I learn to be  
a lawful lover void of jealousie,  
and thou a constant wife.

(*Four Plays*, Intermean', p.32; Waller, p.312)

Similar techniques involving player-spectator contact are demonstrated by two sequences of direct address in Field's comedies

Why am I thus rewarded women, women?  
Hee's mad by Heaven that thinkes you anything  
But sensual Monsters, as I now...

(*Weathercock*, II.1.202)

Oh men! what are you? why is our poore sexe  
Still made the disgrac't subjects, in these plaies?

(*Amends*, II.2,106)

These two soliloquies are interestingly parallel. Both address people in the audience, fully aware of the theatre context. In the passage from *Amends* this is particularly precise. 'These plaies' include, of course, the earlier *A Woman is a Weathercock* and *Amends for Ladies* itself. *Amends* was written as an answer to *Weathercock*. Hence, though the apostrophe maybe generalized, the circumstances of delivery are particular, controlled by the self-reflexive nature of its statement.

The same self consciousness about the theatre repertoire in its context is shown in the last scene of *A Woman is a Weathercock*. 'I consecrate my deed unto the Cittie' says Strange in one of the short speeches that forms its pseudo Epilogue, and he continues

                    And hope to live my selfe, to see the day  
                    It shall be shewne to people in a play.  
*Scud.*          And may all true love have like happier end,  
                    Women forgive me; Men, admire my Friend.  
*World*      On parson on, and Boy out-voice the Musicke,  
                    Ne'ere was so much (what cannot heavenly powers)  
                    Done and undone, and done in twelve short howers.

(*Weathercock*, V.2.229)

Strange's remarks are, perhaps, conventional enough; in their knowing glance at the 'people' watching his 'play'. But Scudmore's direct appeal to the spectators is more complex. The invitation to the spectators is patent. When they applaud the players are they not also asked to applaud the skill of the playwright - the actor playing Scudmore indicating, perhaps, Field playing Nevill? Nevill is the play's puppet master. He has manipulated the plot



strands. Strange's story has been 'shewne to people in a play'. And Worldly's comment seems also to invite applause for the playwright's craft in integrating so much action into his skilfully plotted design. Scudmore's appeal to the women in the audience is timely. At the play's opening he is far less conciliatory. On discovering that his beloved Bellfront is to marry another man he launches into a stirring attack

Married? It may be so,  
But women looke too't, for if she prove untrue,  
The Divell take you all, that are his due.

(*Weathercock*, I.1.189)

In all these early examples from *Amends* and *Weathercock* the passages of direct address are, ambivalently, both with and without the dramatic fiction. The attacks by the Wife, Scudmore and Strange on the men and women in the audience result from hurt administered within their stories, yet all are fully aware of their theatrical contexts. At the end of the play, the relationship with the spectators secure, Field can afford to be more playful in his use of direct address. He is more certain of the spectators compliance.

A similar development in player-spectator closeness can be seen in the Page's speeches in *A Woman is a Weathercock*. His complicity with the audience grows as the play continues. He plays no part in the plot, and participates in little dialogue with characters in the playworld. He speaks more lines to the audience than he does to anyone on stage, acting as a commentator and controlling the spectators' responses to Count Frederick's absurdities and Wagtail's salacities. Initially the Page is separate from the spectators - 'Now ye shall tast the means by which he eates'. A shift in pronoun, however, indicates the Page's sense of a closer association:

Marrie my comfort is, wee shall heare by and by, who has given  
her the Casting bottle.

(*Weathercock*, II.2.19)

Repeating the device used so successfully in *Weathercock*, the Page in *The Fatal Dowry* also takes the opportunity to address his audience. He comments on the moral lessons to be drawn from watching Novall Junior and his parasites. The Page's comments unite the gallants in the play world with those in the theatre. Novall Junior explains to his friends how

there cannot be a more evident, palpable, grosse manifestation of  
poore degenerate dunghilly blood, and breeding, then rude,  
unpolish'd, disordered and slovenly outside.

and the Page remarks

An admirable lecture. Oh all ye gallants, that hope to be saved  
by your cloathes, edify, edify.

(*Fatal Dowry*, IV.1.51)

Though there is entertaining satirical bite here, it is softened by its being mediated through the child. The real point of the lines lies in their appeal to the spectators. The page is asking them to recognise that the play fiction is being well performed - an 'admirable lecture'.

Seldom in *Amends for Ladies* also invites the audience's admiration and at the same time encourages their identification with him when he comments on his own actions:

This custome in us Cittizens is good,  
Thus walking off when men talk with our wives,  
It shew's us curteous, and mannerly,  
Some count it basenesse, hee's a foole that does so,



It is the highest point of pollicie  
Especiallie when we have vertuous wives.

(*Amends*, II.1.84)

Seldom's use of the plural pronoun emphasises his awareness of the citizens who attend Whitefriars to see his play.

Field's concern to connect actor and audience in as direct a way as possible is also indicated by the frequency with which he writes scenes in which a surrogate audience, more or less complicit with the real one, comments on the performances of fellow players. Pendant's commentary on Sir Abraham's futile attempts to write poetry is one example. The extended scene in which Pendant and Wagtail gull Sir Abraham Ninny, discussed in Chapter Nine, uses a similar technique.

Such effects are not confined to his comedies. The sequence in which Theanor and the lords enjoy watching the foolish Onos and his companions is a further example from *The Queen of Corinth* and here the union of onstage and 'real' audience is confirmed by the anachronistic reference to the 'gentlemen with Tobacco in our Theaters' (*Queen of Corinth*, p.11; Waller, III.1, p.37). The commentary of the observer, communicated by direct address to the spectators, encourages their unity. Why should Field so frequently, and often so reflexively, breach the 'separating membrane' between our 'consciousness of the events portrayed and our consciousness of the actual theatrical events that convey the story'?<sup>10</sup> The answer is, at least in part, pragmatic. Direct address is one of the surest ways of rousing the audience from boredom or indifference. Doris Fenton describes how

if not used too frequently its unexpectedness startles and surprises them into attention. In some instances too the effect is less of the actor's stepping out of his world, than of drawing the audience into his; making them feel that they are actually part of it.<sup>11</sup>

In Field's plays and scenes direct address has this double function though it is hardly unexpected. It is one of his standard techniques. In Field's scenes almost everybody gets a chance to soliloquize or to talk directly to the spectators. The intimacy with spectators achieved by *Hamlet* or *Richard III* is unique to the eponymous characters dominating those plays. But in *Amends for Ladies*, to take just one example, at least six of the nine or so major roles has the opportunity to address the audience directly. This may also reflect the ensemble nature of the piece but the device is not restricted to Field's early comedies. In his section of *The Fatal Dowry* the four leading protagonists all have significant passages of direct address. These bond player and spectator as citizen, gallant, man or woman experiences, if only momentarily, a sense of identity with the characters on stage.

Field also unites spectators with other spectators by appealing to their sense of superiority and privilege. They are made party to topical jokes and allusions that exclude those not lucky enough to be in that particular venue at that particular time. They are treated as experienced playgoers, knowledgeable about the London theatre scene. When, for example, Lord Feesimple proposes a visit to 'Long-Megg and the ship at the Fortune' the audience is flattered into recognising its own, and Field's, superiority over the entertainments offered by a rival playhouse.<sup>12</sup> 'Certayne lewde Jigges, songes and dances used and accustomed at the playhouse called the Fortune in Goulding Lane' were suppressed the year after *Amends for Ladies* was written (Gurr, *Playgoing*, pp.225-6). Perhaps one of these was 'the ship' that Lord Feesimple was keen to see. *Amends* includes another topical joke - this time much more extended - in the representation of Marion Frith, alias Moll or Mall Cutpurse, on the stage (*Amends*, II.1.16). She was notorious in and around Whitefriars in 1611-12. Summoned by the Ecclesiastical Court to



enquire

whether she had not byn dishonest of her body & hath not also  
drawne other women to lewdnes by her perswasion & by  
carrying her selfe lyke a bawde

Marion Frith confessed that she had dressed as a man and frequented  
'alehouses Tavernes Tobacco shops' and 'play houses',

...being at a play about three quarters of a yeare since at ye  
Fortune in mans apparel and in her boots and with a sword at  
her syde.<sup>13</sup>

Anything that could be done at the Fortune could be done at Whitefriars, so *Amends for Ladies* provides the opportunity for Moll to be presented on this stage too. She and Grace have a conversation about hangers for a sword, a direct reference to her appearance on the Fortune stage. This episode is completely irrelevant to the plot. Thematically one could argue that Moll, with her masculine dress and ready tongue, is another portrait to set alongside the other women of the play - the Maid, Widow and Wife of the debate. It is her presence too that allows the reversal of a theatrical stereotype. Grace is refusing the letter Moll brings from a suitor shows her virtue as a citizen's wife - thus undercutting the expected love intrigue which demands that more than lawful goods are exchanged over shop counters. But more important than all of these motives for Moll's introduction are the playhouse reasons - the opportunities it provides for a display of comic acting in the exploitation of an extraordinary figure of popular contemporary interest, and the pleasure it gives the spectators to be party to a theatrical 'in-joke'.

Field flatters his spectators by his assumption that they know the contemporary theatre scene. He *uses* their knowledge of theatrical

conventions. This is exemplified by a sequence from *A Woman is a Weathercock*. Kate demands revenge for the slander on her honour.. She addresses her citizen husband

Nay Ile thinke  
As abjectly of thee, as any Mongrill  
Bred in the Citty; such a Cittizen  
As the Playes flout still, and is made the subject  
Of all the stages.

(*Weathercock*, II.1.273)

The conduct of Field's play contradicts the premise advanced by Kate. Strange, her husband, proves himself a valiant citizen, successfully avenging the slur on his wife, not at all the type of citizen usually shown in a play. The self-referential nature of the comment relates to the dramaturgical customs of other playwrights and works best if the spectators are theatrically alert.

Playfulness with theatrical conventions also underlies a series of scenes involving the absurdities of romantic love. The debts to other plays are openly acknowledged. A good example here is a passage from *A Woman is a Weathercock* involving Sir Abraham Ninny. He tells Worldly that his suit to Lucida is unprofitable because she

laughes at me; and scornes my sute:  
For she is wilder, and more hard withall,  
Than Beast, or Bird, or Tree, or stonie wall.

(*Weathercock*, I.2.339)

He is not allowed to get away with this patent plagiarism from *The Spanish Tragedy*, since Kate, enjoying the discomfiture of her sister's suitor,



comments 'Ha, Godamercie old Hieronimo'.<sup>14</sup> Further, the spectators, with more accurate knowledge of the source of the quotation, might recognise that the lines are in fact spoken by Balthazar, not Hieronimo, and so the comic effect moves a stage further. The dialogue then becomes patterned in its sequence of rhymes as Sir Abraham becomes the victim of a series of insults

*Abra.* Yet might she love me for my lovelie eies:  
*Count* I but perhaps your nose she doth despise.  
*Abra.* Yet might she love me for my dimpled chin:  
*Per.* I but perhaps your Beard is verie thin.  
*Abra.* Yet might she love me for my proper bodie.  
*Stra.* I, but she thinkes you are an arrant Noddie.

(*Weathercock*, I.2.343)

and so on, culminating in Lucida's rejection. This extended parody of Balthazar's speech is interesting in that it assumes familiarity with the seriousness of the original, and that it expands its linguistic mode from monologue to dialogue. In *The Spanish Tragedy* Balthazar debates with himself. In *Weathercock* comedy is provided by the whole group of actors, as they fill out the words with comic business, grouping and movement. The stasis of *The Spanish Tragedy* becomes the ensemble of *Weathercock*. Sir Abraham's clothing and general appearance continue to be an object of mirth

...I cannot endure these round Breeches,  
I am readie to sound at em.  
*Kate* The Hose are comely  
*Luci.* And then his left Leg: I never see it but  
I think on a Plum-tree.  
*Abra.* Indeed there's reason there should be some difference  
in my legges, for one cost me twentie pound more than  
the other.

(*Weathercock*, I.2.367)

Finally, in an absurd parody of the behaviour of a disdained lover, he throws off his clothes

...off Garters blew;  
Which signifies Sir *Abrams* love was true.  
Off Cypresse blacke, for thou befits not me;  
Thou art not Cypresse, of the Cypresse Tree,  
Befitting Lovers ...  
Gush eyes, thumpe hand, swell heart, Buttons flie open,  
Thankes gentle Dublet ...

(*Weathercock*, I.2.388,389)

The absurd visual comedy of the scene is here reinforced by the shift from prose into a kind of jig jog rhyme, causing Pendent<sup>a</sup> to comment:

I know he is in love, by his Verse vaine

(*Weathercock*, I.2.381)

The self-conscious reference to the play's medium adds another dimension for the spectators - an appeal to recognise the playwright's craft at the expense of a comic character. Abraham's inadequacy in rhyme is further demonstrated when Pendent overhears his attempts to compose a love sonnet. The incongruity of the juxtaposition of domestic detail with conventional classical allusion adds to the humour. The romantic lover of theatre convention is not lying on 'beds of flowers' but playing bowls.

*Enter Sir Abraham throwing downe his Bowles*

*Abra.* Bowle they that list, for I will Bowle no more,  
*Cupid* that little Bowler in my brest  
Rubs at my heart~~and~~ will not let me Rest.

(*Weathercock*, III.3.1)



Rhymes degenerate into absurdity as he apostrophises Cupid.

Oh boy, leave pricking, for I vaile my Bonnet,  
Give me but breath where I do write a Sonnet.

Sir Abraham's attempts at writing produce ludicrous results.

*Abra.* Thy servant *Abraham* sends this foolish Dit-  
Tie unto thee, pitie both him and it.  
*Pen.* Tie unto thee ...  
*Abra.* But if thou wilt poore Sir *Abraham* frump  
Come grim death come, heere give thy mortal thumpe.

(*Weathercock*, III.3.30)

'Oh see the power of love: he speaks in ryme' his tutor comments as Onos in *The Queen of Corinth* abuses the mistress who has rejected him. The satiric portrait here, modelled on Sir Abraham, is anachronistically the 'humorous lover' of Jacobean theatrical convention. As the Tutor explains

Thus walkes he night and day, eates not a bit,  
Nor sleepes one jot, but's grown so humorous;  
Drinkes Ale, and takes Tobacco as you see;  
Weare's a Steelette at his Codpeece close,  
Stabs on the least occasion...

(*Queen of Corinth*, p.15; Waller, IV.1, p.50)

He, like Sir Abraham, throws off his clothes in passion

Garters, fly off: go Hatband, binde the browes  
Of some dull Citizen that feares to ake:  
And Leg appeare now in simplicity  
Without the trappings of a courtier:  
Burst Buttons, burst, your Bachelor is worm'd.

...

Hang haire like Hemp, or like the *Isling* curs  
For never Powder, nor the Crisping-iron  
Shall touch these dangling locks ...

(*Queen of Corinth*, p.15; Waller, IV.1, pp.50-51)

To an increasingly critical commentary from onlookers Onos works himself, via some singularly inappropriate images, into a frenzy of revenge.

...my disgrace sharper than Mustard-seed

...

Love is a golden bubo, full of Dreames:  
That ripen'd breake and fills us with extreames.

*Tut.* A gold buble, pupil ...

*Onos* I will not be corrected now:

I am in love, revenge is now the Cud  
That I do chaw: I'll challenge him.

(*Queen of Corinth*, p.15; Waller, IV.1, p.51)

The scene is composed of familiar elements - the thinness and crookedness of legs, the ludicrous pedigree, the satiric commentary.

One further episode demonstrates Field's sophisticated skill in handling metatheatrical effects. Rejected by the wealthy Lamira, but determined to find a woman, Laverdine comes across Montague's loving page, Veramour.

The thought of this Boy hath much coold my affection to his  
Lady, and by all conjectures this is a disguised whore; I will try if  
I can search this Mine.

(*Honest Man's Fortune*, p.163; Waller, III.1., p.249)

Clearly Laverdine has seen too many plays. Further asides during the action that follows allow the spectators to monitor Laverdine's success. At first Veramour responds angrily to his advances,



Lie with you? I had rather lie with my ladies Monkey ...  
*Exit* Veram.

*Lav* I thought so, I know by that 'tis a Woman, for because,  
peradventure she hath made tryall of the Monkey, she  
prefers him before me, as one unknown ...

(*Honest Man's Fortune*, p.163; Waller, III.1, p.250)

Angered by his persistence Veramour eventually confesses

I perceive tis vaine to conceale a secret from you: believe it Sir,  
indeed I am a woman ...

(*Honest Man's Fortune*, p.166; Waller, IV.1, p.257)

and to his delight she says she loves him. All seems set for the conventional  
happy ending. Laverdine introduces his bride to the assembled company

*Liv* [sic] This is the Gentlewoman

*Mont.* 'Tis my Page, sir

*Ver.* No sir, I am a poor disguis'd Lady?  
That like a Page have followed you full long for love  
god-wot.

*Omnes* A Lady - *Laverdine* - yes, yes, tis a Lady.

*L.Orl.* Why wore you boyes cloathes?

*Ver.* I'll tell you Madam,  
I took example by 2 or 3 playes, that methought  
concerned me.

(*Honest Man's Fortune*, p.171; Waller, V.1, p.277)

But of course, in a splendidly comic reversal of expectation a shock for the  
audience as much as for Laverdine, Veramour, as the Courtier's fumbling  
discovers, is actually a boy after all. Here the foolishness of the courtier is  
used to satirize the very theatrical conventions that have given him life, and  
which Field uses for serious purpose elsewhere. The way Field handles this  
Laverdine Veramour plot shows just how much more conciliatory he is to

his spectators than Ben Jonson in a similar situation. P.K.Ayers explains how the final trick of *Epicoene* works. At the end of the play Jonson's audience

find themselves victims of a blatantly theatrical trick for which they are not only unprepared but in which they discover that they have themselves participated in their own deception. They have in one sense known all along that *Epicoene* is a boy disguised as a woman; it is their theatrical sophistication that Jonson exploits, not their ignorance. The disconcerting effectiveness of the device depends upon the self-referential manipulation of the way in which the audience interprets dramatic reality in terms of theatrical conventions.<sup>15</sup>

The dénouement of *The Honest Man's Fortune* depends similarly on the realisation of the congruent 'boyness' of both the role in the dramatic fiction and the actor in theatrical reality, but the spectators are not disturbed in the same way. Their confidence in the parameters of the play world is undiminished, their laughter increasing because of their delighted recognition that what might have happened within the fiction has not done so. But the inversion of stereotype whereby the boy page remains resolutely a boy and not a Julia, Viola or Maid, is surprising without being hurtful. Having fun with the convention does not destroy it. Teasing the spectators does not insult them. Veramour's motive for admitting, falsely, to being a girl in disguise is merely fun - 'I took example by 2 or 3 playes' (*Honest Man's Fortune*, p.171; Waller, V.1, p.287).

Some of the best effects in Field's work are provided by moments when he is obviously writing for a specific theatre audience. One of these occasions is the confrontation between the Widow and Bould in *Amends for Ladies* (III.3). In terms of the play's fiction the audience is kept in ignorance that Bould, in pursuit of his Widow, has gained access to her by his disguise as a waiting gentlewoman, Mistress Princox. In a scene of relaxed bawdy prose the Widow and her maid discuss cosmetics, men and the ways of the world.



This is amusing enough but an extra edge would be given to the humour of the scene if the spectators were familiar enough with the regular members of the company playing *Amends for Ladies* to recognise their leading actor and, further to acknowledge, at least the possibility that Mistress Princox might be a man in disguise. The scene in which Princox, a name which immediately arouses such a suspicion, prepares her mistress for bed relies on a whole series of 'doubles entendres' which set the tone for what follows. It is as if the disguised Bold were in himself a kind of physicalised, visualised 'double entendre'. A quotation can give a taste of what I mean:

- |              |                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
|--------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Widow</i> | Come, vndresse me, would God had made me a man.                                                                                                                                                  |
| <i>Bould</i> | Why, Madame?                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| <i>Widow</i> | Because I would have beene in bed as soone as they, wee are so long vnpinning and unlacing.                                                                                                      |
| <i>Bould</i> | Yet many of vs Madame are quickly undone sometime, but herein we have the advantage of men though they can be a bed sooner than we, i'ts a great while when they are a bed e're they can get up. |
| <i>Widow</i> | Indeed if they be well laid <i>Princox</i> , one cannot get them up againe in hast.                                                                                                              |
| <i>Bould</i> | Oh God Madame, how meane you that, I hope you know, ill things taken into a Gentlewomans eares, are the quick corrupters of maiden modestie...                                                   |

(*Amends for Ladies*, III.3.4)

Princox has an individual way of speaking, prosy and proverbial. Deeply shocked by her mistress Princox reproves her in a spirited though cliché-ridden defence of chastity.

- |              |                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
|--------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|              | I beseech your Lady-ship for your own credit and mine, let the bridle of judgment be alwaies in the chaps of it to give it to give it head, or restraine it, according as time and place shall be convenient. |
| <i>Widow</i> | Precise and learned <i>Princox</i> , dost not thou goe to <i>Blackfryers</i> .                                                                                                                                |

*Bould* Most frequently Madame, unworthy vessel that I am to partake or retaine any of the delicious dew, that is there distilled.

*(Amends, III.3.25)*

The Widow's response and Princox's admission depend for their laughter on the audience's familiarity with Blackfriars as the location for brothels as well as for a playhouse. If Field played Bould then even more comedy can be got out of the scene. He spent several years as a boy player in the Blackfriars acting in plays that preached moral lessons. No doubt he also frequented the brothels. Unfortunately the full humour of these exchanges is not now retrievable but one can enjoy the challenge for the actor that the scene presents. When the Widow chastises Princox with

thou art an old fumbler I perceive: me thinkes thou doest not do things like a woman.

*(Amends, III.3.46)*

'she' apologises and asks 'let my good will stand for the action'. The Widow, entering into the bawdy spirit of this conversation, conducted as she thinks between two women, makes explicit the sexual innuendoes here. Yet the conversation is funnier for those in the audience who realize that Bould means exactly what he says. So too at the splendid moment when the Widow says to Princox

Well, well, come to bed, and wee'le talke further of all these matters.

*(Amends, III.3.125)*

She exits and Bould confidently welcomes the success of his scheme.



Fortune, I thanke thee, I will owe thee eies  
For this good turne ...  
Of, false disguise that hast been true to me,  
And now be *Bould*, that thou maist welcome be.

(*Amends*, III.3.127,130)

This revelation does not come as a total surprise to the audience. Allied to their feeling of shock is a sort of satisfied expectation, which can only be fully realised if the player of Bould has prepared for the moment properly by giving enough hints that Mistress Princ Cox is not what she seems. Playing up the ridiculous discrepancies in her story, sharing an obvious delight in B<sup>u</sup>ld's attractions with the audience, are other ways in which the moment is prepared for but the sexual innuendoes are the most important. These are enhanced if the spectator is a regular member of the theatre audience, and can bring his knowledge of company and convention to the performance.

The same active sense of theatre is demanded by a range of direct references to plays in Field's work. Seldom asks Lord Proudly

Did you never see  
The Play, where the fat Knight hight *Old-castle*,  
Did tell you truly what this honor was?

(*Amends*, IV.3.24)

with the intention of preventing his duel of honour. Unless the spectator is familiar with Falstaff's disquisition the point of Seldom's question is lost. Incidental references to Mad Orlando and Durandan and to 'the beare in the play' indicate an audience familiar with other popular entertainments.<sup>16</sup>

Players are proud of their telling the story well. It is no surprise when Liladam steps out of character after a particularly exciting scene to tell the spectators 'Here will be sport for you. This works' (*Fatal Dowry*, II.2.331) or when Nichodemus enjoins them to 'Mark what follows' (*Four Plays*,

'Honour', p.29; Waller, p.302).<sup>17</sup> There are many other metatheatrical comments. 'Foolish anger makes me talke like a Player' confesses Montague (*Honest Man's Fortune*, p.162; Waller, III., p.247) and Dubois behaves like 'a stale bragart in a Play' (*Honest Man's Fortune*, p.161; Waller III.1., p.242). Incidental comment draws attention to 'the fencing skill of our tragedian Actors' (*Four Plays*, 'Honour', p.29; Waller, p.301). Characters are aware of the plays they are in - 'this sceane is only mine' insists Charalois (*Fatal Dowry*, II.1.73). They are aware of their own theatre language - 'Then in plain Prose thus' (*Honest Man's Fortune*, p.161; Waller, III.1, p.242). These effects are, of course, conventional, but they act as tiny reminders that his spectators are watching a play. Like the black hangings conventionally used for playing tragedies, incorporated into the plot of *The Queen of Corinth*, such references are the product of a playwright acutely conscious of the theatres in which his fictions are being performed.

(ii)

I turn now to the second movement within Field's plays and scenes - the fostering of imaginative engagement. His basic methods here concern the material he presents for the audience's consideration. Field makes things as easy as possible for his spectators by making his fictions accessible and familiar. Nothing is allowed to impede easy comprehension. The story is clearly told and, to this end, entries are prepared for, characters are announced and named appropriately. At a structural level the same concerns are demonstrated. Exposition is direct and unambiguous, developments are



carefully prepared and explained, denouements are preceded by useful recapitulations. Sometimes concern for narrative clarity overrides characterization but this is not much of a problem since the characters too are familiar, being frequently stereotypic or generic. Clear signals about them are given by their names. Plots are comfortably direct and eventful, conventional for the most part. Local references and familiar details flatter the spectators into a sense of security, and to a consciousness of superiority. They know what is going on, and what to expect. Both literally and metaphorically, they know where they are. This is why Field includes so many references to local topography and people, and why he sets his plays in places that, whatever their names, are obviously London. It is a practical and reassuring strategy. Robert Smallwood, writing in connection with *The Alchemist*, notes that such elements are standard 'in the dramatists' quest for a sense of immediacy with their citizen audiences'.<sup>18</sup> In Jonson's case the intention is primarily moral; exposure of follies is Jonson's satiric aim. With Field it is different. Identification with the familiar reduces the imaginative effort audiences have to make and unites them by calling on common experience. It has little didactic purpose. This web of familiar references allows engagement, a willing entry into the playworld where even the heroes of French history behave exactly like Jacobean Londoners. *A Woman is a Weathercock* and *Amends for Ladies* declare their allegiance to London by a range of precise topographical reference - to Pict Hatch, Cheapside, Pie Corner, the Temple, Brideswell and, further afield, the pond at Islington, Newington Butts, Moorefields and Gravesend. Sometimes these are rather clumsily interposed - as when Strange opens a scene with 'Oh these are *Lambeth* fields' (*Weathercock*, IV.2.1). More successful is a sequence from *Amends for Ladies* where the information is skilfully integrated into both character and action. The 'roarers' demand more to drink

*Whore* ...by this flesh lets have wine, or I will cut thy head off,  
have it rosted and eaten in *Pie-Corner* next  
Bartholomew-tide.  
*Draw.* Gentlemen, I beseech you consider where you are.  
*Turne-bole* streete, a civil place do not disturbe a  
number of poor Gentlewomen, Master *Whoore-*  
*bang*, Ma: *Botts*, Ma: *Teare-chops* and Ma: *Spill-*  
*bloud*, the Watch are abroad.  
*Spilb.* The Watch? why you rogue, are not we Kings of  
*Turne-bole*?

(*Amends*, III.4.8)

Perhaps gallants in the audience for *Amends* who alternated, if Sir John Davies's *Fuscus* is typical, visits to the playhouse with ones to the bawdy house, would actually recognise Besse Turnups.<sup>19</sup> Certainly the Drawer indicates that the actors might.

I have been heere at *Besse Turnups*, and she sweares all the Gentlewomen went to see a Play at the Fortune, and are not come in yet, and she beleeves they sup with the Players.

(*Amends*, III.4.24)

A dig at a rival company and the description of the 'vestals' of Turnbull Street as Gentlewomen increase the laughter here by well worn familiar jokes.

When later in the same play the Widow rejects Bould's suggestion that they should continue his impersonation

'Tis a stale one  
And was done in the *Fleete* ten yeares agoe

(*Amends*, IV.1.124)

the allusion must refer to some anecdote now lost to us. The identity of Bould's 'wry leg'd fellow', by inference an excellent juggler, is likewise



unknown (*Amends*, IV.1.139).<sup>20</sup> The effect of these casual references on a contemporary audience must have been an increased security of expectation. They would feel at ease and identify with characters who share their topography, interests and entertainments.

The use of verisimilitude to unite spectators in laughter is a commonplace of city comedy but one might not expect the classical settings or the French historical background of Field's tragi-comedies to yield very much local colour. Yet even here Field's characters share his audiences' *milieu*. This is not just a failure of Field's imagination. As the scenes he created from *The Knight of Malta* sources show, he is quite capable of transmuting historical and exotic material into striking verbal and stage imagery.<sup>21</sup> But if this is not simply incompetence what kinds of game is Field playing when Black Snout, Calveskin and Snip Snap of *The Faithful Friends* become Jacobean inhabitants of the same tavern as Botts, Whore-bang, Spilblood and Tearchops in *Amends*'s London, despite their ostensible classical setting, or when the row between Nichodemus and Cornelius (*Four Plays*, 'Honour') is pure Eastcheap? When, in commending his lord, Pendant refers to him as

the onely Bowler in *London* that is not a Church Warden

(*Weathercock*, III.2,41)

the bawdy innuendo and the glancing blow at the Church combine with the topographic reference to create laughter appropriate to the play's setting. The same device is repeated in *Four Plays*, 'Honour'. Cornelius laments his wife's adultery and in a satisfying mixture of classical rhetoric and contemporary topography orders

Flow forth my tears, thou hast deflowered her *Tarquin*, the  
Garden of my delight, hedg'd about, in which there was but one  
bowling Alley for mine owne private procreation, thou hast, like

a thief in the night, leap'd the hedge, entered my Alley and  
without my privitie, plaid thine owne rubbers.

(*Four Plays*, 'Honour', p.300)

An image used by the page in *The Queen of Corinth*, commenting on Onos' temerity in challenging his master, shows how Field imagines Corinth as just another London.

*Page* Sir Foole? a Challenge to my Lord?  
How dar'st thou, or thy ambs-ace here think of him,  
Ye Crow-pick'd heads, which your thin shoulders beare  
As doe the poles on *Corinth* Bridge the Traitors:  
Why you three Nine-pins, you talke of my Lord,  
And Challenges?

(*Queen of Corinth*, p.16; Waller, IV.1, p.53)

This is not simply incompetence. The collision between the play world and that of his spectators, encouraged by this sort of reference, creates a tension which provides a cradle on which to rest the play. There is a special *frisson* to be gained by such reminders of the co-existence of familiar reality and performed fiction. So knighthoods are gained in Corinth just as they are in London. 'Away you Pezants with your bought Gentry', says the Page (*Queen of Corinth*, p.16; Waller, IV.i, p.53). For some of Field's spectators the satiric targets of the scene in which the tutor educates Onos would have special significance. The tutor and spectators become complicit in the playing of the scene.

*Tut* Whence shall this challenge rise? for you must ground it  
On some such fundamentall base, or matter  
As now the Gentry set their lives upon.  
Did you ere cheat him at some Ordinary  
And durst he say so, and be angry? If thus,  
Then you must challenge him: hath he call'd your whore  
Whore; though she be (beside yours) twenty mens?  
Your honour, reputation is touch'd then,



And you must challenge him: Has he deny'd  
 On thirty damne me's to accommodate money,  
 Though he have broke three score before to you?  
 Here you must challenge him: Durst he ever shun  
 To drink two pots of Ale wi' ye? or to wench,  
 Though weighty businesse otherwise importun'd?  
 He is a proud Lord,  
 And you may challenge him: Has he familiarly  
 Dislik'd your yellow Starch, or said your Dublet  
 Was not exactly frenchifi'd? or that, that report  
 In faire tearmes was untrue? or drawn your Sword,  
 Cry'd 'twas ill mounted? Has he given the lye  
 In circle, or oblique, or semy-circle,  
 Or direct paralell? you must challenge him.  
*On* He never gave my direct apparrell the lye in's life.  
*Tut* But for the crown of all, Has he refus'd  
 To pledge your Mistris health though he were sick?  
 (*Queen of Corinth*, p.15; Waller, IV.1, p.52)

The long quotation is essential to appreciate the tutor's comic set piece, surely performed with more than half an eye on the audience. It calls for exaggerated stage business, and reactions from Onos in response to the balanced repetitions of 'you must challenge him'. At the same time the tutor seems to be choosing examples from his audience, especially if someone there were wearing a yellow starched ruff.<sup>22</sup> This episode is only one of many in which familiarity and complicity both engage and detach the spectators, creating a tingle of excitement as Field manipulates boundaries.

Writing of the use of place names and titles in *Richard III* Ralph Berry concludes that

all London references must connect with virtually the entire audience. The effect of each reference is a minor shock of recognition. The places names are tiny *foci* of dramatic energy, pellets of meaning released into the audience's bloodstream.

(Berry, p.26)

The idea here of 'connecting' with the audience is a useful one in the context



of Field's use of topographic and topical references. The 'minor shock of recognition' to which Berry refers engages the spectators with the fiction. Interest is maintained as they wonder what will happen next. They are ready to pay attention to the story.

The subjects of these stories are also entirely familiar. Field's plays are inhabited by parasites, newly dubbed knights, travellers, fashionable dressers, lawyers, creditors and citizens. These are, of course, the standard figures of citizen comedy whose social milieu and conventions Alexander Leggatt has defined and discussed.<sup>23</sup> But Field's use of these characters is not confined to those of his plays which can be said, albeit loosely, to belong to this genre. Agenor in the tragi-comedy *The Queen of Corinth* and Novall Junior in the tragedy *The Fatal Dowry* are as fashionable dressers as Count Frederick or Laverdine in *A Woman is a Weathercock* or *The Honest Man's Fortune*. One can scarcely distinguish between the rapacious creditors of Montague in *The Honest Man's Fortune* and of Charalois in the tragedy *The Fatal Dowry*. Witty pages, chaste wives, bawdy waiting women, grotesque old people and braggart soldiers move through Field's fiction in a comfortingly familiar way. One thinks, too, of Field's line of foolish gallants, Sir Abraham Ninny, Lord Feesimple, Sir Pergamus, complete with dwarf, and of Laverdine and Onos.

These characters may be taken from stock but often the linguistic energy of their presentation lifts them above mere stereotype. Norandine and Captain La Poope, for example, are both types of 'braggart soldier' but they are both very different, the one flashily verbose, the other taciturn and sinister. Pontalier, Nevill, and Romont all share the same plot functions in their aid for their friends but their characterizations differ as much as their friends do. Sir Abraham Ninny, Lord Feesimple, and Sir Pergamus are all foolish gallants but they have different histories. In *Amends for Ladies*, for example, Lord Feesimple exposes his own foolishness by complaining of his



father

...he never brought me up to any Lordly exercise, as fencing, dancing, tumbling and such like: but forsooth I must write and reade, & speake languages, and such base qualities fit for none but Gentlemen...a poxe a writing, reading and languages, let mee be brought up as I was borne.

(*Amends*, I.1.275.280)

A familiar technique is being used here but it is none the worse for that -- especially since Lord Feesimple is obviously enjoying himself.

In *The Faithful Friends* another foolish knight is made a familiar source of laughter.<sup>24</sup> Audience anticipation is skilfully built up by Flavia's description

He is stild the right worshipfull S<sup>r</sup> Pergamus  
a Gallant of some six hundreth a yeare  
but no more Witt, then I wish my husband should have  
...  
he goes Wadling upp and downe the streets  
as if he were driueing a flock of geese before him  
but six hundreth pounds a yeare drownes greater faultes  
then these about the Cittie...

(*Faithful Friends*, II.2.1022, 1035)

What comic actor could fail to appreciate an entrance prepared for so well

... some body knocks if it be hee  
expect to heere a perfect Comedie.

(*Faithful Friends*, II.2.1039)

There follows an extended passage of clumsy rhyme emphasising with its 'doubles entendres' Pergamus' inadequacies in performances of all kinds, while his 'dwarf' Dindimus ensures the undercutting of his heroics by neatly placed comments.

*Fla.* Alas what meanes my loue you affright mee  
 are these fitt tooles to come a woing with  
*Dind.* I neare knew a woman finde fault wth long toole before.  
 (Faithful Friends, II.2.1058)

Domestic detail and epic aspiration clash when Flavia abruptly lowers the tone later in the scene

*Fla.* Come S<sup>r</sup> Pergamus, till yo<sup>r</sup> horse come you and I'll go play at shuttlecock  
*Per.* A match i ffaith I love that sport [well] alife  
 Yet my mother chargd me not to use it  
 for feare a putting my arme out a joynt.  
 (Faithful Friends, II.2.1123)

There is an endearing charm here in Pergamus' failure to recognise Flavia's bawdy intentions and in the sudden glimpse we have of his careful mother. He is characterized with a history. This gives him a comic energy that rounds out the stereotype ju<sup>s</sup>t as Sir Abraham Ninny's account of his encounter with the cook does in *A Woman is a Weathercock*.

The targets of Field's comic attacks are familiar and in keeping with the values of many of his spectators. 'Squalling Lawiers' (Faithful Friends, I.2.14) are a ready butt. Ingen and his brother discuss the outcome of Ingen's approaching duel with Lord Proudly

*Bro.* He has the advantage of you being a Lord,  
 For should you kill him you are sure to die,  
 And by some lawyer with a golden tongue,  
 That cries for right, ten angels on his side;  
 Your daring meete him, cal'd presumption:  
 But kill he you, hee, and his noble friends  
 Have such a golden snaffle for the jawes  
 Of man-devouring Pithagorean Law,  
 Thei'll reyne her stubborne chaps...  
 (Amends, IV.4.31)



The same sentiments are expressed, perhaps with less metaphoric confusion, by Strange when he responds to his prospective father-in-law's suggestion that he should

*World.* Take your revenge by Law.

*Stra.* It will be thought  
Your greatnesse, and our money carries it:  
For some say some men on the backe of Law,  
May ride and rule it like a patient Asse,  
And with a Golden Bridle in the mouth  
Direct it unto any thing they please.

(*Weathercock*, II.1.309)

When the satire is more fully integrated into the texture of the play it is more successful and much funnier. Disputes in the law courts underlie much of *The Honest Man's Fortune* and *The Fatal Dowry* and in both plays tedious and unjust processes are both mocked and laughed at. Not all exchanges are as genial as this.

2 *Law.* So shall all  
Your adversarie's pleadings strengthen your Possession.

1 *Law.* And be set upon record  
To witnesse the hereditary right  
Of you and yours.

2 *Law.* Courage, you have the law.

*Long.* And you the profits.

(*Honest Man's Fortune*, p.150; *Waller*, I.1, p.205)

Like lawyers, creditors are the villains of the Jacobean stage and Field capitalises on this. In both *The Honest Man's Fortune* and *The Fatal Dowry* they become the source of black humour. In *The Fatal Dowry* they are

woolvish mungrells!  
Whose braynes should be knockt out, like dogs in July,  
lest your infection poyson a whole towne.

(*Fatal Dowry*, II.1.143)

In *The Honest Man's Fortune* Montague asks Mallicorn for financial help to rescue him from

...blood-hounds that for a sum  
Lesser than their honesties, which is nothing,  
Wo'd teare me out of my skin.

(*Honest Man's Fortune*, p.158; Waller, II.1, p.232)

One of the creditors with a sardonic pun presses his claim.

...bid him pay his friends with hopes and pay us with currant  
Coyne: I knew a gallant once that fed his creditors still with  
hopes, and bid 'em they sho'd feare nothing, for he had 'em tyed  
in a string; and trust me so he had indeed, for at last he and all  
his hopes hopt in a haltar.

(*Honest Man's Fortune*, p.158; Waller, II.1, p.233)

The 'citizen villain', Mallicorn, refuses in terms cruelly parodying the Last Supper.<sup>25</sup>

I protest I ha' not the present summe (small as it is) to lay down  
for you, and for giving my word, my friends no latter then  
yesternight made me take bread and eate it, that I sho'd not do it  
for any man breathing i th' world; therefore I pray hold me  
excused.

(*Honest Man's Fortune*, p.148; Waller, II.1, p.234)

Mallicorn admits that he has laid the trap for Montague 'to enjoy this money I have of yours with more safety', and even at this serious moment, when the humour is painful, Field forces in a topical joke against citizens. Mallicorn's



motive is revenge.

An honest Citizen cannot wholly enjoy his own wife for you, they grow old before they have true use of them, which is a lamentable thing, and truely much hardens the hearts of us Citizens against you.

(*Honest Man's Fortune*, p.158; Waller, II.1, p.234)

The opposite, of course, is true for the citizens in the audience whose hearts warm to Montague. Citizens are a common target for satire in many of the Blackfriars plays but on the whole they come off rather well in Field's. In *A Woman is a Weathercock*, Strange, a wealthy citizen, successfully avenges a slur on his wife's honour. In *Amends for Ladies* not only is Grace Seldom a model wife but she employs her citizen wit to great advantage against Lord Proudly. This is an example of how Field reworks familiar material, varying the stereotype. So, against type, Seldom is described as 'an exceeding wise Citizen, a very sufficient understanding man, and exceeding rich' (*Amends*, I.1.394). He is a happy man, rejoicing in the beauty and virtue of his wife. His character is attractive.

...this goodnesse is not usuall in our wives, well *Grace Seldome*, that those art faire is nothing, that those art well spoken is nothing, that thou art wittie is nothing, that thou art a Citizens wife is nothing; but *Grace*, that thou art faire, that thou art well spoken, that thou art wittie, that thou art a Citizen's wife, and that thou art honest I say, and let any man denie it that can, it is something, it is something, I say it is *Seldomes* something, and for all the sunshine of my joy mine eyes must raine upon thee.

(*Amends*, II.1.6)

Though the characterization is unusually warm here the situation is conventional. One expects confidence like Seldom's in a citizen comedy to precede a fall. But Field reverses expectation as Grace Seldom wittily

dismisses Proudly.

*Grace* Fie, fie, you talk uncivillie my Lord.

*Proud.* Uncivillie, mew, can a Lord talke uncivillie? I thinke you a finicall taffatae pipkin may be proude ile sit so neare it, uncivillie mew.

*Grace* Your mothers cat ha's kitten'd in your mouth sure.

*Proud.* Prithee but note yon Fellow, do's he not walke & look as if hee did desire to be a Cuckold?

*Grace* But you doe not looke as if you could make him one.

(*Amends*, II.1.91)

My last example of Field's use of stereotypical characters is Zanthia in *The Knight of Malta*. In his recent book A.G.Barthelmy provides a damaging picture of her

By far the most malevolent of all the Moorish waiting women in seventeenth century drama is Zanthia in Beaumont and Fletcher's [sic] *The Knight of Malta*. Not only does she willingly betray her mistress, she also wishes to murder her. Zanthia's perfidy and malice spring, as one might expect, from her uncontrolled, if not uncontrollable lust...<sup>26</sup>

This is true only in part. The stereotype is useful when as Abdella, the Moorish servant appears in the non-Fieldian part of the play. This is also how she appears in Field's Act V, where she is the silent recipient of Norandine's abuse. But in Field's Act 1 the stereotype is rounded out with a more sympathetic characterization: her motives being genuine love, not lust. When Mountferrat states that

It is not love, but strong *Libidinous* will  
That triumphs o're me

(*Knight of Malta*, p.73; Waller, I.1, p.85)



it is of his own feelings that he speaks. There is nothing in Act 1 to make one question Zanthia's genuine feeling for Mountferrat and her regret at her betrayal of her 'sweet lady' as she laments

Oh! what Chaines  
Of deity, or duty can hold love?

(*Knight of Malta*, p.72; Waller, I.1, p.85)

Her forthright declaration of love, so much more open than her white compatriots, suggests to me a jealous honesty rather than evil

My tongue Sir, cannot lisse to meet you so,  
Nor my black Cheeke put on a feigned blush  
To make me seeme more modest than I am,  
....and yet *Mountferrat*, know,  
I am as full of pleasure in the touch  
As ere a white fac'd puppet of 'em all, .  
....I can as blithly work in my loves bed  
And deck thy faire neck, with these Jetty chains  
Sing thee asleep, being wearied, and refresh'd  
With the same organ, steale sleep off againe.

(*Knight of Malta*, p.72; Waller, I.1, p.84)

The language is sexual but there is nothing to suggest that it is not sincere.

Field, then, is good at individualising stereotypes and, while basing his work firmly on convention, at varying the situation they find themselves in. There are certain scenes to which he returns again and again. His dramaturgy is based on standard elements, familiar to, and expected by, his spectators. A constant motif of Field's plays is, like the Grace-Proudly scene I have just discussed, a scene in which a chaste woman confronts a would-be seducer. Chastity, as Leinwand makes clear, is of fundamental importance to Field's spectators.

In a society where the transmission of property was contingent upon the legitimacy of heirs, it was essential that a man could be certain of his wife's chastity before, and her fidelity during

marriage. Indeed, next to her dowry (over which she had no control) a woman's chastity was her sole possession.<sup>27</sup>

The theatrical possibilities of the conflict, and the sexual titillation it offers, are considerable and there are many examples in Jacobean drama.<sup>28</sup>

The testing of the Wife in *Amends for Ladies* is an interesting variant on the convention. She resists the advances of the man wooing her at her husband's request, and she is sympathetically characterized. She is severely maltreated by her husband, himself a conventionally jealous figure, yet she forgives him, and, in appropriately moral tones asserts

...for let him doe  
The most preposterous ill relishing things  
To me, they seeme good, since my Husband does 'em.

....

And thus it should be with all vertuous Wives.

(*Amends for Ladies*, V.1.101.105)

So far, then the conduct of the plot is entirely as to be expected. Yet just at the moment of reconciliation Field, teasingly, raises a tiny flicker of doubt, and allows us, to use Leggatt's words, 'a glimpse of a real woman's face beyond the mask of virtue' (Leggatt, p.83).

Rise, rise, Sir, pray:  
You have done no wrong to me; at least  
I thinke so;

(*Amends*, V.1,134)

Her generic name 'Wife' and her allying herself with 'all virtuous wives' suggest a stereotype but her performance within the conventional scene glances at an alternative.

Another scene between a virtuous woman and an intending seducer is



that between the Widow and Bould which I have already discussed. Field again plays with the convention. The variant here is that the Widow loves Bould - and her refusal to sleep with him is as much for his sake as her own. This is something Peery ignores in his dismissive comment 'though quite fleshly in her speech Field's widow is of virtue quite as staunch as the wife'.<sup>29</sup> The sexual content of this scene is fundamental and its power lies in the tension this sets up between the stock situation and the characterization of its protagonists. There is a real relationship between the characters here. Conventional values are endorsed but not entirely straightforwardly since the Widow can admit her own need.

Virtuous women are very much part of Field's stock in trade. The trials endured by the Wife in *Amends for Ladies* prefigure those of the Lady Orleans in *The Honest Man's Fortune*. Oriana and Lucinda in *The Knight of Malta* and Merione in *The Queen of Corinth* provide further examples of scenes in which virtuous women are subjected to the cruelties of men. Sometimes these are but the conventional chastity tests as exemplified by Miranda's testing of Oriana in *The Knight of Malta*, Montague's of Lady Orleans, in *The Honest Man's Fortune* and Armanus's of Philadelpha in *The Faithful Friends*. Martius's treatment of Dorigen in *Four Plays, 'Honour'*, provides an interesting variant. He retreats to the 'testing' convention when his true motives become apparent. The plot of *The Faithful Friends*, in an act not by Field, is also resolved very clumsily by the use of this convention.

There is a second factor at work in these scenes. Even in his tragicomedies Field makes extensive use of sexual humour. The efficacy of this in forging bonds between spectators and players, and in unifying an audience, has been described by A.P. Rossiter.

The dramatist makes bawdy jokes and the audience is softened up, made suggestible,... Public speakers know this - and some lecturers. To say that it is 'getting the listeners on your side' is too simple. Rather, it is making an audience of them.<sup>30</sup>

With Field the 'simple' explanation is right. He is very concerned to get the spectators on his side. Sexual humour is one of his most heavily used theatrical devices to unify and control and involve his spectators. A few examples from the many available must serve. A major agent of sexual humour is cross-dressing. Field makes serious use of this convention in his presentation of the Maid in *Amends for Ladies*, or Lelia in *The Faithful Friends*, where the characters achieve a direct and moving simplicity, but even then his purposes are theatrical not literary. Meaningful statements about role or identity, or thematic explorations of gender, are subordinated to plot function and to the opportunities cross-dressing provides for a range of theatrical effects and sexual comedy.

The usefulness of cross-dressing in promoting plot lines is well demonstrated by *Amends for Ladies* where the Maid's disguise is essential to the development of the plot. But there are also present in the play three men who dress as women. Bould's disguise as Princox is the mainspring of the Widow plot but the relevance of Frank's dressing as Ingen's fiancée or Lord Feesimple's as a bride is fairly perfunctory. The motive seems largely to give opportunity for displays of comic acting, and to provide sexual humour.

Field includes popular elements in his plays whether or not they relate directly to their plots. Shaving and barber scenes are staples of comic dramaturgy, and Field seizes on the opportunities they provide for comedy regardless of their relevance or genre. This type of scene fits most happily into the comedy *A Woman is a Weathercock*



*Enter Count Fredericke, a Taylor trussing him, attended by a Page.*

*(Weathercock, I.2.1)*

We are encouraged by the satiric commentary of the Page to find Count Frederick's self obsession and Pendant's flattery amusing. Pendant assures the Count that he is irresistible to women.

*Pend.* Hart, I should follow you like a young rank whore,  
That runs proud for her love, plucke you by 'th sleeve  
Who ere were with you, in the open streete,  
With the impudencie of a drunken Oyster-wife.

...

Scratch faces like a Wilde Cat of *Pict-hatch*.

*Count* *Pendant*, thou't make me dote upon my selfe

*Pend.* *Narcissus* by this hand, had far less cause

...

Why Boy his presence would enkindle sin,  
And longing thoughts in a devoted Nun:  
Oh foote, oh Legge, oh Hand, oh body, face  
By *Jove* it is a little man of wax.

*Count* Th'art a rare Rascall; Tis not for nothing  
That men call thee my Commendations.

*Page* For nothing, no, he would be loath it should.

*(Weathercock, I.2.59.67.74)*

The comedy here is from several sources; the ludicrous complacency of the Count, stage business in Pendant's mechanical catalogue, wordplay in the Page's quick riposte and, most notably, in the comically inappropriate juxtaposition of its sequence of images. The low comedy of drunken oyster wife and the wild cat of Pict Hatch, firmly contemporary London allusions, contrasts in tone with Narcissus whose beauties were 'but shaddowes to my Lord'. It is surely not flattery to suggest that you will be pursued by whores. The sexual undercutting of the episode is also skilfully emphasised by the pun on 'proud'. Count Frederick is rendered absurd in this comedy of manners. This is entirely appropriate to his role in the comedy as a whole.

In the tragicomedy *The Queen of Corinth* the dressing of Agenor follows exactly the same pattern but is less appropriate in this context.<sup>31</sup> Agenor, established elsewhere in the play as an admirable and courageous young lover, is an inappropriate victim for social satire here since it devalues him. Humour may come from his dislike of his stockings

....I would have had 'em peach-collour  
All young and new about me: and this Scarfe here  
A goodly thing: you have trickt me like a Puppet

(*Queen of Corinth*, p.6; Waller, II.1, p.19)

and of his 'paire of Breeches, [which] look like a paire of Bagpipes' but they do not help the characterization of Agenor. Integrating the satiric comment into the action instead of having an observer mediating between players and spectators is also less successful than the similar scene in *Weathercock*.

Field returns to the dressing scene convention in the tragedy *The Fatal Dowry* where he encounters similar problems to those in *The Queen of Corinth*. The set piece is not appropriate to the character of Novall Junior as required by the plot, where it is his forceful and energetic influence that precipitates the tragic action of the play. Though there may be some thematic justification for placing Novall Junior at the centre of a dressing scene - it emphasises his moral triviality - I feel Field has been guided by less literary motives. It is one of his stock devices and it is good for actors to perform. Characterization and theme are subordinated to pleasing the spectators with a skilful piece of comic staging. As in the *Weathercock* example a Page acts as a detached and witty commentator as grouping and business are dictated by the dialogue. A long quotation is needed to give the flavour and pacing of the scene.

*Enter Novall Junior as newly dressed. A Taylor, Barber,  
Perfumer, Liladam, Aymer, Page.*



*Nov.* Mend this a little: pox! thou hast burnt me: Oh fie  
 upon't, O Lord hee has made me smell (for all the world)  
 like a flaxe or a red headed womans chamber: powder,  
 powder, powder.  
*Perf.* Oh sweet Lord! *Novall sits in a chaire,*  
*Page* That's his Perfumer *Barber orders his haire*  
*Tayl.* Oh deare Lord, *Perfumer gives powder*  
*Page* That's his Taylor *Taylor sets his clothes*  
*Nov.* *Monsieur Liladam, Aymour,* how allow you the modell  
 of these clothes?  
*Aym.* Admirably, admirably, oh sweet Lord! assuredly its pitty  
 the worms should eate these.  
*Page* Here's a fine cell; a Lord, a Taylor, a Perfurmer, A Barber  
 and a paire of *Mounsieurs*: 3 to 3 as little wit in the one  
 as honesty in the other...

(*Fatal Dowry*, 1632, Hr; IV.1.1)

As the scene develops the parasites become more and more absurdly reverential and the Page increasingly caustic.

*Nov.* Pox a this glasse! it flatters, I could find it in my heart to  
 breake it.  
*Page* O save the glasse my Lord, and breake thir heads, they are  
 the greater flatterers I assure you.

(*Fatal Dowry*, IV.1.60)

Viewed in isolation this is an amusing and well written episode but it is extraneous, motivated by the need to please spectators, and, thus, perhaps, regrettable. In this section I have been considering how Field provides spectators with conventional material whose variations are themselves reassuring and familiar. Spectator reassurance and security also dictate how Field tells his stories.

Narrative instinct dominates Field's plays and scenes, and ensuring narrative clarity is his prerequisite. Direct address, soliloquy and aside are again his standard techniques. At its simplest a character tells the spectator exactly what he is up to. Sometimes concern for audience comprehension is too apparent. Neville's detailed explanation of his motives and actions is clumsy and over-explicit.

...heere's the charracter of his face and beard.  
 By this means, when my friend confronts the Maide,  
 At the Church doore (where I appointed him  
 To meete him, like my selfe: for this strange shape  
 He altogether is unwitting of)  
 If she (as one Vice in that sex alone  
 Were a great Vertue) to inconstancy past,  
 Joyne impudency and sleight him to his face  
 ...  
 By this attempt it will be frustrate  
 ...  
 The reason too, I do this past his knowledge,  
 Is that his joy may be the more compleat;

(*Weathercock*, II.1.6.15.19)

Pouts's brief comments on his situation are much more successful in the vigour of his address to the audience.

I have plaide the melancholy Asse, and partllie the Knave, in  
 this last businesse, but as the Parson said that got the wench with  
 child, Tis done now Sir, it cannot bee undone, and my purse or I  
 must smart for it.

(*Weathercock*, III.4.1)

Subtle too confesses his villainy directly to the audience - his change in address being skilfully ordered around the Husband's exit.



....I will straight  
Follow and give you an answer.  
*Husb.* You must do it. *Exit*  
*Subt.* Assure your selfe deere – Coxcombe, I will do it  
Or strangely be denied, all's as I wisht,  
This was my aime, although I have seem'd strange.  
I know this fellow now to be an Asse.

(*Amends*, I.1.497)

On other occasions the explanation is offered to the audience not in a soliloquy but in an aside. This is true of a whole series of swift comments which ensure that the audience, though not the victim, is aware that a test is being administered. 'Yet I will try her to the very block' says Miranda of Oriana (*Knight of Malta*, V.2, p.154). The Queen's assumed anger is 'Only to try thee this, for though I love thee, I can subdue my selfe' (*Queen of Corinth*, p.13; Waller, III.1, p.43). Valerius, seeing the distress of his brother, explains 'I must try a way to be resolved' (*Four Plays*, 'Honour', p.30; Waller, p.305).

The Maid, realising that Ingen's bride is merely his brother in disguise, does not immediately reveal her own identity, but the audience is admitted to the reasons for reticence:

Oh doe not burst me joy, that modestie  
Would let me show myselfe to finish all.

(*Amends*, III.2.49)

Her brief aside pre-empts objections to the story's implausibility at this point. Similar reasoning may lie behind Ferdinand's absurdly clumsy explanation of his failure to save Violanta:

...that good I did intend  
for satisfaction, saving of her life,  
my equall cruell starres made me forget.

(*Four Plays*, 'Love', p.37; Waller, p.329)

More convincingly Lelia in *The Faithful Friends* explains why she will continue to disguise herself as the page, Janus. Her beloved Marius is off to the wars so

...no danger shall detain mee  
but step by step ile still attend on him.  
and dally with destruction.

(*Faithful Friends*, I.3.679)

Her revelation as 'wretched Lelia' at this point has been well prepared for by brief asides earlier in the scene. Armanus makes similar use of asides on hearing the news of his friend Tullius's death.

Rufinus is a Villin and I feare,  
this is some hellish strategem of his  
ayming at Tullius life thus to divulge  
his death ere it be acted, swift as thought  
ile fly unto the Campe, if there be plotts  
my notice may prevent trechery.

(*Faithful Friends*, III.2, 1896)

The audience are then in a position to answer Philadelpha's question which follows immediately - 'Whethers Armanus posted in such hast' (*Faithful Friends*, III.2, 1902). Laverdine in *The Honest Man's Fortune* makes his intentions plain to the audience when he sees the Page Veramour.

The thought of this Boy hath much coold my affection to his  
Lady, and by all conjectures, this is a disguised whore; I will try if  
I can search this Mine...

(*Honest Man's Fortune*, p.163; Waller, III.1, p.249)

Another way in which spectators are kept in close touch with the story



is by giving the characters names which signify.<sup>32</sup> Further, these names are in constant use, not confined to speech headings and entrance directions, so that they would be as obvious in performance as on the page.

Genre and source material demand that charactonyms in *The Fatal Dowry*, *The Knight of Malta* and *The Queen of Corinth* come from French, Maltese and classical history respectively. In *The Fatal Dowry* Bellapert, the bawdy waiting woman, Aymer, Novall's parasite and Novall himself have significant names. In *The Knight of Malta* the nationalities of the central protagonists are indicated by name and the moral qualities of its hero are patent in his name, Miranda. In *The Faithful Friends* Janus, the name the disguised Lelia assumes, suggests something of her double nature while Philadelpha's beauty and virtue are emphasised by her name. Snipsnap the tailor and Calveskin the shoemaker are occupationally named. Mallicorn and his confederate Captain La Poope in *The Honest Man's Fortune* have significant names, the one sinister with its association with blighting harvest and with cuckolds, the other comic in its combination of military with bawdy allusions. The loving fidelity of the page in the same play may also be indicated by his name, Veramour. Information, and some fun, may be gained from the names of characters in Field's tragedies and tragicomedies. Much of this is, of course, incidental and is not carried through consistently but the hints are there. Charactonyms are not confining, however, as they may be in the plays of Ben Jonson.<sup>33</sup> Satiric points are not made by naming. There is nothing in Field to compare with, for example, the rapacious animal naming of the cast of *Volpone*. The closest we come to this sort of depersonalisation is the generic naming of Maid, Widow and Wife - appropriately general for a play centred on a debate about the relative value of those states. But even here, in performance, the characters have significant yet personal names.

Goodmorrow to the glory of  
our age  
The Lady *Perfect* and the Lady *Bright*,  
The vertuous wife and widow: but to you  
The Lady *Honor*, and my Mistresse,  
The happinesse of your wishes

(*Amends*, I.1.77)

This greeting of Ingen's is entirely typical of Field's dramaturgy.

Field is unusually punctilious about what Warren Smith describes as 'entrance announcements'.<sup>34</sup> Working from Shakespeare texts Smith reached the very obvious conclusion that these statements were necessitated by the depth of the stage at the Globe and the extreme upstage position of two main entrances. Since, he asserts, other members on stage would have their backs to the stage doors, and not see the entering character, speeches of the 'Look where he comes' type are essential. They 'prepare the stage for a regrouping that will include both occupants and enterers' (Smith, p.407 and p. 406). He should add that they also provide a good build-up to an entrance for a player. Entrance announcements in Field's work have an expository as well as a practical function. They are also eminently theatrical.<sup>35</sup> Smith found that the 'great majority [of entrance announcements in Shakespeare's plays] do not include the name of the enterer' (Smith, p.405). This is in contrast to Field's whose concern to let his audience know exactly what is happening leads to passages of dialogue like this.

*Enter old Sir Innocent Ninnie, my Lady Ninnie, Sir Abraham, and Mistris Wagtayle.*

*Count* Heere's more Guesse.

*Cap.* Is that Man and Wife?

*Per.* It is Sir *Innocent Ninnie*, that's his Lady,  
And that Maister *Abraham* their onely sonne.

(*Weathercock*, I.2,139)



or

*Enter hastily M. Seldome with papers on his arme.*

*Omnes.* Whose this? whose this?

*Maid* This is our Land-lord, Master Seldome,  
an exceeding wise Citizen, a very sufficient  
understanding man and exceeding rich.

*(Amends, I.1.391)*

The opening of *The Honest Man's Fortune* is interesting in this respect. Within three or four lines the characters and their relationships have been introduced.

*Amiens* Morrow, my Lord of Orleance.

*Orl.* You salute me like a stranger; brother *Orleance* were  
to me a Title more belonging, whom you call the  
Husband of your sister.

*(Honest Man's Fortune, p.149; Waller, I.1, p.203)*

The information is repeated a few lines later as confirmation

*Dub.* Here comes your adversarie's brother in law.

*Long.* The Lord of *Amiens*.

...

*Mont.* Your sister is my adversarie's wife...

*(Honest Man's Fortune, p.149; Waller, I.1, p.204)*

In *The Queen of Corinth* Euphanes's elevation through becoming a favourite to the queen is crucial to the plot, so his entry in III.1 is preceded by dialogue about him, and followed by a series of greetings emphasising this point.

Even if his costume did not immediately identify Mountferrat as a Knight of Malta his opening soliloquy would soon tell the audience this was the case. He plunges them straight into the story.

*Mount.* Dares she despise me thus? me that with spoile  
And hazardous exploits, full sixteene yeares  
Have led (as hand-maides) Fortune, Victory.  
Whom the *Maltezi* call my servitors?

...

But by the honor of this Christian crosse  
(In blood of Infidels so often dyde)  
Which mine own soul and sword hath fixed here  
And neither favor nor births priviledge  
*Oriana* shall confesse, although she be  
*Valetta's* Sister our Grand-master, here...

(*Knight of Malta*, p.71; Waller, I.1, p.79)

Within nine lines of the opening of 'Honour' we have identified the Athenian Sophocles, and the Roman Martius. Sophocles' vanquished state is shown by his appearing bound. Dorigen is immediately identified on her entry by name and her status as Sophocles's wife confirmed within six lines. Again repetition allows ready identification. Nichodemus and Cornelius are instantly identified as Corporal and Sutler the moment their exchanges begin (*Four Plays*, 'Honour', p.28; Waller, p.299). Expectation has been built up by their earlier interruption into the dialogue between Martius and Sophocles and their dismissal as 'fish-faced rascals'. Sometimes the emphasis given to speedy exposition leads to an over-explicit use of detail. Clumsiness then mars clarity. This is true of the opening section of 'Love'. Violanta's plight is, presumably, made apparent visually since she is directed to enter '*with childe*, and her first line identifies her lover. 'Why does my *Gerrard* grieve?' she asks. His answer, though useful to the audience wanting to pick up the story quickly, is extremely awkward.

*Ger.* O my sweet Mistris,  
'Tis not life (which by our Milain law  
My fact hath forfeited) makes me this pensive:

...



but since your love  
made poor incompatible me the parent,  
(Being we are not married) your dear blood  
Falls under the same cruel penalty:...

(*Four Plays*, 'Love', p.32; Waller, p.313)

After a rapturous interruption by Violanta, Gerrard continues

O, but my rarest *Violane* [sic] when  
my Lord *Randolpho* brother to your father,  
shall understand this, how will he exclaim,  
that my poor Aunt and me, which<sup>h</sup> is free alms  
hath nurs'd, since Millain by the Duke of *Mantua*  
(who now usurps it) was surpriz'd? that time  
my father and my mother were both slaine  
with my Aunts husband, as she says, their states  
despoiled and seiz'd; 'tis past my memory,  
but thus she told me: only this I know,  
since I could understand, your honour'd Uncle  
hath given me all the liberal education,  
that his own son might look for had he one...

(*Four Plays*, 'Love', p.32; Waller, pp.313-4)

The desperate recourse to parenthesis, and the appeal to 'but thus she told me', show just how much characterization has been subordinated to plot lines. Concern for clear narrative here betrays Field into clumsiness. More elegantly, spectators are reminded of 'the story so far' before important climaxes in the plays. In V.2 of *The Honest Man's Fortune*, for example, we are reminded of the current situation by the question 'is not this the day/ The Virgin Lady doth elect a husband' and realise that a decisive moment in Montague's life has arrived. Essential recapitulation precedes pivotal episodes of crisis. In *The Knight of Malta* Miranda's series of summary statements, culminate in his appeal to Oriana

And can you be so  
Cruell, thanklesse, to destroy his youth  
That sav'd your honour, gave you double life?

Your own and your faire Infants? that when fortune  
(The blind foe to all beauty, that is good,)  
Banded you from one hazard to another,  
Was even Heavens Messenger, by providence  
Call'd to the Temple, to receive you there  
...*Gomera's* jealousy  
Strooke dear unto thy heart...

(*Knight of Malta*, p.92; Waller, V.1, p.152)

Bellapert's insistence on explaining Novall Junior's situation to him despite his full awareness of it has a similarly recapitulatory function.

You say my Ladie's married. I confesse it.  
That *Charalois* hath injoyed her, 'tis most true  
That with her, hee's already Master of  
The best part of my old Lords state...  
...He wrong'd you shrewdly...

(*Fatal Dowry*, III.1.21)

This chapter began by emphasising the actor/playwright's dependence on his spectators, and went on to identify Field's concerns with their simultaneous engagement and detachment. Theatrical conventions are strategies common to both these movements. Recognised and openly acknowledged by spectators, playwright and players alike, they provide a firm unifying structure for plays and scenes which might otherwise be torn apart by opposing tendencies. They have value in themselves since they imply something fundamentally secure, familiar and reassuring in a play's vision.<sup>36</sup> This is the essence of popular entertainment. So Field's work reassures his spectators by its presentation of the familiar and predictable in modes that are easy and comforting. Their interest lies in the way that he then plays sparkishly across the boundaries between the spectators' faith in the fiction and the open acknowledgement of their place in a particular theatre with a particular company at a particular time.



## NOTES

1. Tom Stoppard, *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead*, second edition (London, 1968), pp.45-46.
2. I realise that all playwrights are aware of the needs of their audience to some extent but Field had this as his priority. Entertainment, not literary exploration or debate, is his *métier*.
3. Keir Elam, *The Semiotics of Theatre and Drama* (London and New York, 1980), p.38.
4. 'Engagement' and 'detachment' are terms used by Maynard Mack. 'Engagement and Detachment in Shakespeare's Plays', in *Essays on Shakespeare and Elizabethan Drama in Honour of Hardin Craig*, edited by Richard Hosley (Columbia, 1962), pp.275-96.
5. S.L.Bethell, *Shakespeare and the Popular Dramatic Tradition* (London, 1944).
6. Trevor Nunn, 'From Conference Hall to Theatre', in *This Golden Round: The Royal Shakespeare Company at The Swan*, edited by Ronnie Mulryne and Margaret Shewring (Stratford-upon-Avon, 1989), pp.1-8 (p.3).
7. Ralph Berry in his introduction to *Shakespeare and the Awareness of Audience* makes the point that at any one performance of a play the audience is both unique and disparate. Field, in writing initially for the private playhouse, may have had a more homogeneous audience in mind than that of the Globe, but recent researches on audience composition suggest that the differences between 'coterie' and 'public' playhouses proposed by Alfred Harbage were overstated. Ann Jennalie Cook's large-scale study of the Elizabethan theatre audiences proposes that all theatres addressed themselves to, and attracted spectators from, the 'socially free' and the 'privileged'. This view has in turn been challenged by Martin Butler in an appendix to his book on the Caroline Theatre. Andrew Gurr, reviewing the evidence for 'rival traditions' confirms 'the broad assumption that from 1599 on, the composition of audiences at different playhouses did diverge quite markedly. But the divergences were more a branching out than a simple fork... None of these differences remained constant.' Ralph Berry, *Shakespeare and the Awareness of Audience* (London, 1985), p.x; Alfred Harbage, *Shakespeare and the Rival Traditions* (New York, 1952); Alfred Harbage, *Shakespeare's Audience* (New York, 1941); Ann Jennalie Cook, *The Privileged Playgoers of Shakespeare's London, 1576-1642* (Princeton, 1981); Martin Butler, *Theatre and Crisis, 1632-1642* (Cambridge, 1984); Andrew Gurr, *Playgoing in Shakespeare's London* (Cambridge, 1987), p.72.



8. Anne Richter, *Shakespeare and the Idea of the Play* (London, 1962).
9. John Edmunds, 'Shakespeare breaks the Illusion', in *Shakespeare's Wide and Universal Stage*, edited by C.B.Cox and D.J.Palmer (Manchester, 1984), pp.32-47 (p.37).
10. Stephen Booth, 'Speculations on doubling in Shakespeare's Plays', in *Shakespeare, The Theatrical Dimension*, edited by Philip C.McGuire and David A.Samuelson (New York, 1979), pp.103-131 (p.103).
11. Doris Fenton, *The Extra Dramatic Moment in Elizabethan Plays before 1616* (Philadelphia, 1930), p.11.
12. 'Long Meg' is an Admiral's Men's play of 1594 that presumably survived into the Fortune's repertoire. 'The Ship' is probably a jig since it would have been unusual to have two plays in a single afternoon, the time proposed by Lord Feesimple for the entertainment.
13. Gurr, *Playgoing*, pp.61-63; Mary Beth Rose discusses women wearing men's clothes in 'Women in Men's Clothing: Apparel and Social Stability in *The Roaring Girl*', *English Literary Renaissance*, 14 (1984), 367-391.
14. Thomas Kyd, *The Spanish Tragedy*, edited by Andrew S.Cairncross, *Regents Renaissance Drama* (Nebraska, 1967), II.1.9-10.
15. P.K.Ayers, 'Dreams of the City: The Urban and the Urbane in Jonson's *Epicoene*', *Philological Quarterly*, 66 (1987), pp.73-86 (p.83).
16. Peery suggests that the play with the bear is *Mucedorus*, a popular pre-1598 entertainment, frequently revived. An augmented version was played in 1610 by the King's Men (*Eliz. Stage*, IV, 34). It is also possible that the play concerned was *The Winter's Tale*, with its famous stage direction *Exit pursued by a bear*. This was also performed in 1610/11 (*Eliz. Stage*, III, 489).
17. Direct address is as irresistible to Liladam and Nichodemus as it is to later comic actors. 'See you in the next act', says Ponce Weatherby just before the interval of Henry Livings', *The ffineff family* in an exactly parallel effect. Peter Thomson cites the latter example in 'Henry Livings and the Accessible Theatre', in *Western Popular Theatre*, edited by David Mayer and Kenneth Richards (London and New York, 1977), pp.187-202 (p.195).
18. R.L.Smallwood, '"Here in the Friars": Immediacy and Theatricality in *The Alchemist*', *RES*, ns.32 (1981), 142-160 (p.142).



19. John Davies, 'In Fuscum', *Epigrammes* 39 (1593?), cited by Gurr, *Playgoing*, p.57 and p.209.
20. In its Induction the Stagehand regrets that the poet of *Bartholomew Fair* has avoided entertainments like these. The play omits 'a juggler with a well-educated ape to come over the chain, for the King of England, and back again for the Prince, and sit still on his arse for the Pope, and the King of Spain.' Ben Jonson, *Bartholomew Fair*, edited by E.A.Horsman, *The Revels Plays* (London, 1960), pp.17-20. Scott McMillin reports payment to a 'Juggler' for the entertainments at Salisbury House in 1608. 'Jonson's Early Entertainments: New Information from Hatfield House', *Renaissance Drama*, ns.1 (1968), 153-166 (p.156).
21. Even in exotic Malta the inn signs of London put in an appearance. The name of an inn is referred to when Zanthia is called 'my little labour in vain' and has earlier suggested 'hang me up for a sign somewhere' (*Knight of Malta*, p.72; Waller, I.1, p.83; p.73; Waller, I.2, p.86).
22. Yellow starched ruffs were particularly fashionable at the time of the Sir Thomas Overbury scandal and Mrs Turner's execution. See Beatrice White, *Cast of Ravens: The Strange Case of Sir Thomas Overbury* (London, 1965), p.125, and William McElwee, *The Murder of Sir Thomas Overbury* (London, 1952), pp.48-9, p.203.
23. Alexander Leggatt, *Citizen Comedy in the Age of Shakespeare* (Toronto, 1973).
24. I recognise that *The Faithful Friends* has no performance history, and is only extant in manuscript, but the potential is there in the dialogue.
25. The phrase 'citizen villain' is Alexander Leggatt's but not in this immediate context (Leggatt, p.14).
26. A.G.Barthelmy, *Black Face, Maligned Race; The Representation of Blacks in English Drama from Shakespeare to Southerne* (Baton Rouge, La. and London, 1987), p.128.
27. Theodore B.Leinwand, *The City Staged: Jacobean Comedy, 1603-1613* (Madison, Wisconsin, 1986), pp.140-1.
28. For the treatment in 'Fletcher' plays alone see Nancy Cotton Pearse, *John Fletcher's Chastity Plays: Mirrors of Modesty* (Lewisburg, 1973); Patricia Minton Taylor, 'Modest Maids, Matrons, and Miscreants: the Women in the chastity plays of John Fletcher' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern Illinois, 1981).

29. William Peery, 'The Portrayal of Women in the Comedies of Nathan Field', *Shakespeare Association Bulletin*, 21 (1946), 129-41 (p.137).
30. A.P.Rossiter, 'Comic Relief', in *Angel with Horns and Other Shakespeare Lectures*, edited by Graham Storey (London, 1961), pp.274-292 (p.279).
31. Though not named as such in the speech headings it is clear from the dialogue that Agenor's gentlemen are in fact a tailor and a barber.
32. I have avoided discussion of Onos, Zanthia or Lamia in this since there is some textual confusion as to the names of these characters.
33. For a full discussion of this aspect of Ben Jonson's art see Anne Barton, *Ben Jonson, Dramatist* (Cambridge, 1984), pp.170-93, 198-202, to which I owe the term charactonym.
34. Warren D.Smith, 'The Elizabethan Stage and Shakespeare's Entrance Announcements', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 4 (1953), 405-10.
35. Since Field was writing much of the time for the smaller private theatre he had virtually no need for entrance announcements of this type, yet he still provides cover for entrances, and information about the entering character.
36. Alexander Leggatt makes a similar point in discussing the popular drama *The London Prodigal*. Alexander Leggatt, *English Drama: Shakespeare to the Restoration, 1590-1660* (London and New York, 1988), p.183.



## CHAPTER 12: Theatre Language

The surviving texts of Field's plays and scenes have allowed me to draw certain inferences about their presentation. They declare themselves performance scripts, products of a special relationship between players, spectators and playwright. This section of the thesis pays more detailed attention to the words the players speak and demonstrates how these answer the same imperatives as Field's other strategies: to provide opportunities for players to please spectators.

The greatest contact with spectators is made by Field's prose where he uses their own colloquial language in a range of oaths, proverbs, topical references and so on. Rhythmically familiar and syntactically simple, Field's prose provides a robust support for his players. The same can be said of his blank verse. This is seldom of high literary quality. It avoids extensive metaphor and rhetorical complexity. Rhythm and syntax are correspondent to the speaking voice. Verse and prose modulate easily from one to the other within only a few lines and often it is difficult to distinguish one from the other. Variety is the keynote.

Field's words suggest performance. The living presence of players is indicated by expletives, oaths and non-verbal sounds. Thoughts are left unfinished. Speeches leave room for facial expression, gesture and stage business to complete their meaning. Sometimes this is even achieved through silence. Yet the natural mode is dialogue. Introspective soliloquies are rare: solo speech is almost invariably addressed to the spectators. Interruptions and shared lines create 'the illusion of conversation from a localised setting'.<sup>1</sup> Language, in Field's plays, can be enjoyed for its own sake as word play, extravagant verbal routines and bawdy are woven into the plays' linguistic texture.

If one is looking for deeply etched psychological portraits then one should not turn to the work of Field. But his characterization through



language is adequate for his purposes. For the player he allows sufficient idiosyncratic detail and motivation, enough for him 'to get to know rationally the nature of the character he plays and to analyse the motives that might account for that player's actions'.<sup>2</sup> For the spectators he facilitates easy identification, often by just one or two salient points. Characters are marked by verbal and non-verbal mannerisms. Count Feesimple, the Maid's repulsive elderly bridegroom is, for example, instantly recognizable by his disgusting cough. He reflects on his lack of success with women:

...troth is I love them well, but they loue not me, um, um, um,  
you see, what ill luck, I have with them, ump, ump, ump, a poxe  
on this cold still say I.

*(Amends, V.2.72)*

Wagtail's morning sickness is similarly built into her opening address to the audience, leaving ample room for broad comedy playing. Her approach is direct and invites playing with attack.

Wag. What a stir is heere made about lying with a  
Gentlewoman. I have been lien with a hundred and a  
hundred times, and nothing has come on't, but haulke,  
hum, haulke, hum, oh, oh...

*(Weathercock, II.2.3)*

Clearly in performance the player of Wagtail makes it clear that she is mistaken in saying 'nothing has come on't'. The spectators' recognition of the contradiction between words, vocal sounds and staged action completes the comic moment. 'O mouth, full of agilite' comments Feesimple on meeting 'Mistress Princox'. 'Her' language is prosily and proverbially distinctive

I haue had apt breeding, how ever my misfortune now makes me submit my selfe to seruice: but there is no ebbe so low, but hath his tyde againe: when our dayes are at worst, they will mend in spite of the frowning Destinies...may turne her wheele...to some pinnacle that prosperously may flourish in the Sunne-shine of promotion.

(*Amends*, I.1.317.323.325)

Later comic business in handling ruff and sewing things, or preparing the Widow for bed round out the performance - and, of course, it is Bould's performance, linguistically distinguished from his usual terse and confident tones. Timing, pacing and the most delicate touch are needed for the bawdy innuendoes and sexual allusions to be brought out, while the confident masculinity of the last act is in splendid linguistic contrast.

Linguistic contrast is the principle on which the characterization of Lord Feesimple is built. His early speeches offer many opportunities for gesture and facial expression and this develops throughout the play. Early on he is asked how he comes to be so afraid of swords.

*Fees.* I being in the kitchin, in my lo: my fathers home, the Cooke was making minc'd pyes: so sir, I standing by the Dresser, there lay a heape of plums. Here was hee mincing; what did me I sir, being a notable little witty coxcombe, but popt my hand just vnder his chopping knife, to snatch some Reysins, and was so cut one the hand, and never since could I endure the sight of any edge-toole...

(*Amends*, I.1.288)

The incongruous association of domesticity with a fashionable lord, and the colloquial invitation to inventive stage business make this a delightful moment.

Feesimple is put in touch with a different style of speech when



Welltried undertakes to 'flesh' him. He meets the roarer, Whorebang.

Hang him rogue, shall he die as honourably as the Duke of *Clarence*; by this flesh lets have wine, or I will cut thy head of, have it rosted and eaten in *Pie-corner* next Barthomew-tide.

(*Amends*, III.4.7)

The robust, energetic prose builds to a climax as the stage directions instruct '*Draw and fight, throw pots and stooles.*' (*Amends*, III.4.133) Feesimple acquires a new vocabulary though another of the roarers, Tearechops, objects.

*Teare.* Youle pledge me Sir?

*Welt.* Indeede I will not.

*Fees.* Dam mee hee shall not then.

*Teare.* Lord, use your owne words, Dam mee is mine, I am knowne by it all the towne o're, d'ee heare?

(*Amends*, III.4.120)

In the last act Lord Feesimple has to use his new found language but fails as his potential enemies in turn refuse to follow his script.

*Fees.* ...Dam-me, yee are all the sonne of a whoore, and ye lie, and I will make it good with my sword, this is cal'd Roaring Father.

*Subt.* I'le not meddle with you sir.

*Proud.* You are my blood.

*Welt.* And I flesht you, you know.

*Bould.* And I have a charge comming I must not fight now.

*Fees.* Has either of you anything to say to me?

*Husb.* Not we sir.

*Fees.* Then haue I something to say to you. Have you anything to say to me?

*Bro.* Yes marrie have I Sir.

*Fees.* Then I have nothing to say to you, for that's the fashion.

(*Amends*, V.2.272)

A long quotation is necessary to demonstrate the way the laugh line is carefully paced as Lord Feesimple moves from one group to another and is

finally deflated by the Brother's sudden aggression. The mood and pace of the episode change abruptly.

Someone who shares Lord Feesimple's hatred of 'edge tooles' is Laverdine in *The Honest Man's Fortune*

I do not love to see a sword drawn in the hand of a man that  
lookes so furious, ther's no jesting with edge tooles...

(*Honest Man's Fortune*, p.156; Waller, II.1, p.227)

but he is a great deal more intelligent than his predecessor. Indeed he and the unpleasant Captain La Poope make a formidable pair in their plans to trick Montague out of the little money that remains to him. They succeed, as he tells Duboys,

as easily as a silly Countrey wench of her maydenhead; we had it  
in a twinkling.

(*Honest Man's Fortune*, p.158; Waller, II.1, p.231)

This image is entirely appropriate to their parasitic way of life and to their motive in pursuing that country lady, Lamira. This characterization of Laverdine's is confirmed when he expresses his view of women in an extended passage of bawdry. La Poope, Laverdine and Mallicorn are discussing the likelihood of one of them being chosen by Lamira.

- La-p.* I cannot see  
If I say true, what special ornaments  
Of art or nature, lay aside our lying  
Whoring and drinking, which are no great vertues,  
We are endued withall to win this Lady.
- Mal.* Yet women go not by the best parts ever; that I have  
found directly.
- Lav.* Why should we fear then? they choose men  
As they feed; sometimes they settle  
Upon a White broth'd face, a sweet smooth gallant,



And him they make an end of in a night;  
 Sometimes a Goose, sometimes a grosser meat,  
 A rump of beef will serve 'em at some season,  
 And fill their bellies too: though without doubt  
 They are great devourers: stockfish is a dish,  
 If it be well drest, for the tuffnesse sake  
 Wil make the proud'st of 'em long and leap for't.  
 They'l run mad for a pudding, er'e they'l starve,  
*La-p.* For my own part I care not, come what can come....

(*Honest Man's Fortune*, p.169; Waller, V.1, p.268)

These reductive obscenities are appropriately in character, and they emphasise through their linguistic contrast with Montague's clear and limpid verse, the hero's nobility. Here language serves character and plot in its variety. Phrasing differs from character to character. Sir John Worldly arbitrates between the merchant Strange and Captain Pouts in a distinctively abrupt manner.

You have an honourable Title; a souldier is a verie honourable Title: A Captaine is a Commander of Soldiers; But look you Captaine, Captaines have no money, therefore the *Worldlies* must not match with Captaines... Honor is Honor, but it is no money.

(*Weathercock*, I.2.249.271)

Captain Pouts is dismissed and takes his revenge. In return Strange hurls abuse at him. The situation originates from contrast in character but there is also another motive. Insults are exchanged as much for the enjoyment of the word play and the relishing of terms as for their offensive effect.

*Stra.* Thou unspeakable Rascall, thou a souldier,  
 A Captaine of the Suburbs, a poore Foist,  
 That with thy slops, and cat a Mountaines face,  
 Thy blather chops, and thy robustious words,  
 Fright'st the poore whore, and terribly dost exact,  
 A weekly subsidie, twelve pence a peece,  
 Whereon thou liv'st, and on my Conscience

Thou snapst besides, with cheats and Cut-purses.  
*Cap.* Hart, this is some rayling Poet...

(*Weathercock*, IV.2.85)

The reflexive quality of the Captain's comment here, drawing attention to the staginess of Strange's abuse, creates additional humour. At the same time it ensures a tiny measure of sympathy for the Captain. This is important at this point in the play if the audience is not to feel cheated by his eventual inclusion in the happy ending. Additionally, laughter is provoked by strong linguistic contrasts, and characterisation is enhanced.

In 'Honour' the plainspoken Sutler, Cornelius, demands satisfaction from Nichodemus for the money he owes and the wife he has seduced. In terms reminiscent of Pistol, the braggart soldier replies

Stay thy dead-doing hand, and heare: I will rather descend from my honour, and argue these contumelies with thee, then clutch thee (poor flye) in these eaglet – of mine: or draw my sword of Fate on a Pesant, a Besognio, a Cocoloch, as thou art.

(*Four Plays*, 'Honour', p.28; Waller, p.300)

Cornelius has no patience with his fancy language but retaliates against 'good Corporall leather-chops' with a positive volley of word play of his own.

A – o' your poetically verse: This versifying my wife has horrified me. Sweet Corporall codshead, no more standing on your punctilio's and punketto's of honour, they are not worth a lowse: the truth is, thou art the Generals Bygamie, that is, his fool, and his knave; thou art miscreant and recreant, not an horse boy in the legions, but has beaten thee; thy beginning was knap-sack, and thy ending will be halter-sack.

(*Four Plays*, 'Honour', p.28; Waller, p.300)

Having fun with language like this, by balancing one phrase against a parallel but altered one, or by the repeating of paired terms is a frequent



source of laughter in Field's plays and scenes. Enjoyable both to play and to witness, this sort of language offers satisfaction to players and spectators alike. Though the language is extravagant it is reassuringly and recognisably that of Field's spectators. Captain Norandine belongs as much to Jacobean London as to Malta. When Miranda tells him, in syntactically complex verse, that he has been summoned to enter the order with him, Norandine refuses in contrastingly vigorous and colloquial prose.

I'le none on't; doe they think to bind me to live chaste, sober and temperately, all dayes of my life? they may as soone tye an Englishman to live so; I shall be a sweet Dane, a sweet Captaine, goe up and downe drinking small beere and searing 'ods neagues; no, Ile live a Squire at Armes still, and doe thou so too; and thou beest wise.

(*Knight of Malta*, p.92; Waller, V.1, p.151)

This response is so near ordinary speech that its comic structuring can easily be missed. The rhetorical question and its emphatic denial show how dialogue, even within a solo speech, is Field's natural mode. Awareness of performance needs shapes the balanced phrases, the repetitions and the curious 'odds neagues'. Norandine in creating his comic persona quite consciously allows a dig too at the real Englishmen who form the players' audience. The inverted logic of the progression from 'chaste' (which presumably Norandine might manage) to the horror of 'temperately' (which he certainly would not) means that the implicit pun on Sergeant at Arms goes almost unnoticed but it is this phrase that leads skilfully into the next stage of Norandine's comic turn.

*Nov.* I have found the mystery now, why the Gentlemen weare but three bares of the crosse, and the Knights the whole one.

*Mir.* Why Captain?

*Nov.* Marry Sir, to put us in remembrance, we are but cross'd in

our licence, and pleasures: but the poore Knights cross'd altogether; the brothers at Armes, may yet meet with their sisters at Armes now and then, in brotherly love; but the poore Knights cannot get a lady for love, nor money...

(*Knight of Malta*, p.92; Waller, V.1, p.151)

A similarly skilful comic structuring is apparent in the conversation between Beaumelle and her maids in *The Fatal Dowry*. At first glance the prose seems artless enough but again the phrases are balanced as nouns and verbs are playfully reversed in a series of repetitions and parallels. The socio-satirical edge of their commentary also adds to the fun but its chief motive is surely the opportunities it provides for players to fill out their characters in entertaining their spectators.

*Beaumelle* What is a husband?

*Bellapert* Physicke, that tumbling in your belly will make you sicke ith' stomache: the onely distinction betwixt a husband and a servant is: the first will lye with you when hee please; the last shall lye with you when you please. Pray tell me, Lady, do you love to marry after, or would you marry, to love after?

*Beaumelle* I woulde meete love and marriage both at once.

*Bellapert* Why then you are out of the fashion, and wilbe contemn'd: for (Ile assure you) there are few women i'th world, but either they have married first, and love after, or love first, and married after; you must do as you may, not as you would...

(*Fatal Dowry*, II.2.43)

Sometimes the concern for bawdy humour overrides characterization. Philadelpha in *The Faithful Friends* finds it necessary to explain to the spectators

This wench is honest only straines this mirth to qualifie my sorrow.

(*Faithful Friends*, II.2.1041)



after an exchange of bawdy talk. Philadelpha has asked her maid Flavia about her suitors.

*Phy.* Lord wench what dost thou do with 'em all  
*Fla.* Doo with 'em all, Venus forbid it Madame  
I keepe em at a further distance by my faith  
hees a happie man, that once in a moone gets a tuch  
of my lipps, yet there was a saucie Mercer  
tother day thrust in uppon mee with his yard  
in his hand,...

(*Faithful Friends*, II.2.1004)

Philadelpha's assent to this sort of episode does not fit with the virtuous heroine whose resistance to the king's demands is the mainspring of the plot. Having fun here predominates over character.

Another occasion on which Field is misled into an inappropriate sexual humour occurs in *The Fatal Dowry*. Romont, characterised earlier in the play as an honest, blunt soldier is angered by Novall Junior's betrayal of Charalois. He enters to a commentary by the parasitic courtiers, in which verbal play is accompanied by a kind of physical punning.

*Romont* By your leave, sirs.  
*Aymer* Are you a Consort  
*Romont* D'ee take me for  
A fidler? y'are deceiv'd: looke, Ile pay you.  
Kicks 'em  
*Page* It seemes he knows you one, he bumfiddles you so.  
(*Fatal Dowry*, IV.1.130)

Unfortunately this coarseness undercuts the play's tragedy at a moment when a more sombre note is required. We cannot, as we must, take Romont seriously. Sexual innuendo and the bad pun are forced into Field's dialogue, as regardless of context, we hear of 'long tools', 'yards' and 'iron tails'

(*Faithful Friends*, II.2), 'a golden Bubo' (*Queen of Corinth*, p.15; Waller IV.1, p.51), and numerous variations on 'stand', 'bill' and 'white pudding' (*Weathercock*, I.2.95.298). Field's fondness for bad puns is understandable. These are, as Peter Davison points out in another context, a constant feature of popular entertainment. He explains that

...although wit is a mark of sophisticated society, sheer delight in words for their own sake, and for their sound, is often 'popular' (hence the love of the bad pun so pervasive in English).<sup>3</sup>

For Field, the pun, and especially the bad pun, is useful in both asserting the individuality of the player and stressing the cohesiveness of his spectators. As Davison goes on to say

by demanding that a word means what we wish it to mean, we can subvert due order and rational expectation, but if we gain response from those who hear us - a laugh or a groan - we not merely assert our individuality but gain the acceptance of the group for our independence.... The appeal of the punster in these circumstances is not to the literary critic but to that society of which we are part.

(Davison, p.77)

Davison's point about 'the acceptance of the group' is fundamental to an understanding of Field's strategies. Field uses bad puns in ways which deliberately draw attention to their badness, eliciting a sort of groaning laughter from the audience as they recognise all the old jokes. A single example may suffice in addition to those cited above. In great haste Longaville arriving with a message insists on the maid fetching her mistress:

*Long.* A businesse of emport awaites 'em here,  
And craves for speedy answer.

*Charl.* Are you in post, sir?

*Long.* No, I am in Satin Lady: I would you would be in post...

(*Honest Man's Fortune*, p.165; Waller, IV.1, p.255)



In the wider context of the scene as a whole this exchange engages the audience on Longaville's side and provides a moment of relaxation before his recognition of Montague. Laughter at this point prepares the way for what follows.

The enjoyment of word play for its own sake lies behind the lengthy Tutor/Onos encounter in *The Queen of Corinth*. There is a long history of comic teaching scenes like this. A brief extract demonstrates that classic comic device: 'mistake the word'. The tutor asks Onos

*Tut.* ...Has he given you the lye  
In circle or oblique, or semy-circle,  
Or direct paralell? You must challenge him.  
*On.* He never gave my direct apparell the lye in's life.

(*Queen of Corinth*, p.15; Waller, IV.1, p.52)

Equally familiar is the word play in *A Woman is a Weathercock* where the Count, acting as Sir Abraham's 'straight man', enquires

*Count.* What Countrimen were your Ancestors S. *Abra.*?  
*Abra.* Countrimen, they were no Countrimen, I scorne it, they  
were Gentlemen all,  
My Father is a *Ninnie*, and my  
Mother was a *Hammer*.  
*Cap.* You should be a Knocker then by the Mothers side.

(*Weathercock*, I.2.198)

Interplay between players is fundamental to the way Field structures his dialogue, particularly in comic scenes. At its simplest, one player feeds the laugh line for the other. In an instance from *The Fatal Dowry* precise timing of a player's exit is necessary if Novall Junior's line is to get a laugh. After an angry scene Romont leaves him totally unrepentant

*Romont*            So goodmorrow to your Lordship.

*Exit*

*Novall Iunior*    Good diuell to your rogueship.

(*Fatal Dowry*, IV.1.194)

Another example, this time on an entry, is provided by the arrival of Lord Feesimple. Comic deflation is the strategy here. Lord Feesimple greets the Widow with poetic confidence

*Fees.*     One and thirty good-morrows to the fairest, wisest,  
              chastest, richest Widdow that euer conversation coapt  
              withal.

*Widow*    Three score and two vnto the wisest Lord, that euer was  
              train'd in universitie.

*Fees.*     Oh Curteous, bounteous Widow, shee ha's out-bid me  
              31. Good morrowes at a clap.

(*Amends*, I.1.191)

The rhythms of this exchange from the superlatives of the first line to the coarse simplicity of the last demand mutuality in the playing.

A sequence from *The Honest Man's Fortune* shows the interdependence of players at its most obvious. In addition to the actual dialogue, facial expression, gesture, props and the timing of an exit are all crucial. The presence of Montague, remaining silent but still the focus of the scene, is essential for it to work. Charlotte wishes the page Veramour to leave her alone with Montague. Veramour is equally determined to stay, until a glance from his silent master drives him away. The timing and pauses of the Page's speech show just how important the interplay with both Charlotte and Montague is to complete its meaning.

*Charl.*    ...that's a good child, there's a piece of Gold for thee, go  
              buy a Feather.

*Ver.*     There's two pieces for you, do you goe and buy one, or



what you will, or nothing, so you goe. Nay then I see  
you would have me go sir.

(*Honest Man's Fortune*, p.164; Waller, IV.1, p.254)

Most of the strategies I have examined so far in this chapter have been concerned with comedy. For this Field employs, for the most part, prose. When he wishes to move spectators his medium is verse, flexible enough to allow histrionic display. A simple example occurs during Scudmore's confrontation with his faithless betrothed, Bellafront. In impassioned blank verse he accuses her of inconstancy. Under the pressure of his diatribe the regular rhythm breaks down into repeated apostrophe, unimpressive on the page, powerful in performance.

Oh woman, woman, woman, woman, woman,  
The cause of future and Originall sinne...

(*Weathercock*, III.2.193)

Run on lines keep up the forward movement as the speech shifts into rhymed couplets and, hence, to fractured emotional control.

Lustfull as Monkies, grinning in your ease,  
Whom if we make not Idols, we neare please.  
More vainly proud than fooles, as ignorant;  
Baser than Parasites, Witches that enchant  
And make us sencelesse, to thinke death or life  
Is yours to give...

(*Weathercock*, III.2.200)

More regular, though no less impassioned is Mountferrat's despairing series of apostrophes:

Oh furious desire, how like a whirl wind  
Thou hurriest me beyond my honours point?  
Out of my heart, base lust, or heart, I vow  
Those flames that heat me thus, I'll burn thee in.

(*Knight of Malta*, p.72; Waller, I.1, p.82)

where the broken scansion of the first line and the reversed stress of the third emphasise Mountferrat's emotional instability.

Field's blank verse scansion shifts and breaks under the pressure of the speaking voice of the player and leaves plenty of scope for facial expression and gesture. This is well demonstrated by Sophocles' speech at the climax of 'Honour'. Dorigen has promised to give herself to Martius only if the rocks move - and they have done so. Sophocles, in honour, is bound to give up his wife. As he tries to decide how to deal with the impossible situation he tells Dorigen

*Soph.* Weep not, bright *Dorigen*; for thou hast stood  
constant and chaste (it seems 'gainst gods and men)  
when rocks and mountains were remov'd. These  
wonders  
do stupifie my senses. *Martius*,  
This is inhumane: was thy sickness lust?  
yet were this truth, why weeps she? Jealous soul,  
What doest thou thus suggest? Vows, Magick, Rocks?  
fine tales and tears. She ne'er complain'd before.  
I bade her visit him; she often did,  
had many opportunities. Humh, 'tis naught: O,  
no way but this. Come, weep no more, I have ponder'd  
this miracle: the anger of the gods,  
thy vow, my love to thee, and *Martius*,  
he must not perish, nor thou be forsworn,  
lest worse fates follow us; Go, keep thy oath:  
for chaste and whore are words of equal lenth:  
but let not *Martius* know that I consent,  
O! I am pull'd in pieces.

(*Four Plays*, 'Honour', p.31; Waller, p.308)



Presumably the player of Sophocles moves as he addresses, in turn, his wife, himself, Martius and his own 'jealous soul'. The verse, like Sophocles, is 'pull'd in pieces'. This is reflected in staged action. His feelings are expressed by 'Humh' and 'O' as the varied sentence structures and the accumulating questions and imperatives actively create his shifting moods. The repetition of the threatening *Martius* also emphasises Dorigen's predicament. Neither must one forget the silently weeping figure of Dorigen herself, witness and cause of Sophocles' great grief.

Dorigen's submission to Martius, a few moments earlier, is a similar conjunction of language and movement. Her white-clad figure kneeling before the Emperor is well described by her own imagery:

behold a Princess (whose declining head like to a drooping lily  
after storms bowes to thy feet)...

(*Four Plays*, 'Honour', p.27; Waller, p.296)

When stage and visual imagery coalesce like this Field is successful. The extended scene involving Merione, 'Phebe in a sable cloud' sitting 'like a hill of Snow' cited earlier, furnishes another example (*Queen of Corinth*, III.2). Field is not usually a strongly metaphoric writer. His images are seldom startling or penetrating but, as the instances already cited indicate, they can be very effective. An exchange between Miranda and Oriana, for example, would work well on stage despite the clichéd images with which Oriana describes herself

*Mir.* But one petition, I have done.

*Ori.* What (Sweet).

*Mir.* To call me Lord, if the hard hand of death  
Seize on *Gomera* first.

*Ori.* Oh, much too worthy;  
 How much you undervalue your own price,  
 To give your unbought selfe, for a poore woman,  
 That has been once sold, us'd, and lost her show?  
 I am a garment worne, a vessel crack'd,  
 A zoane untide, a lilly trod upon,  
 A fragrant Flowre cropt by anothers hand,  
 My colour sullyde, and my odor chang'd,  
 If when I was new blossom'd, I did care  
 My selfe unworthy of *Mirandas* spring:  
 Thus overblown, and seeded, I am rather  
 Fit to adorn his Chimney, than his bed.

(*Knight of Malta*, p.93; Waller, V.2, p.154)

Physical interplay between the characters develops as the scene progresses and the dialogue is integrated with staged movement. Miranda's commentary on their situation varies the address and involves the spectators in their debate. At the same time Oriana's physical presence disturbs and distresses him.

*Mir.* Fairest; let go my hand: my pulse beats thick,  
 And my mov'd blood, rides high in every vaine,  
 Lord of thy selfe now, Souldier, and ever:  
 I would not for *Aleppo*, this fraile Bark,  
 This barke of Flesh, no better steeres - man had  
 Than has *Mountferrat's*: may you kisse me, Lady?

*Ori.* No...

*Mir.* ...whilst she doth teach  
 My heart to hate my fond unlawfull love  
 She talkes me more in love, with love to her,  
 My fires she quencheth with her arguments,  
 But as she breathes 'em, they blow fresher fires,  
 Sit further: now my flame cooles:

(*Knight of Malta*, p.92; Waller, V.1, p.153)

At moments like this movement is as indicative as dialogue in conveying meaning.

Colloquial prose may offer greater opportunity for detailed stage



business, in that it approaches nearer to naturalism, but Field's blank verse also demands movement, expression and gesture. Sometimes Field mixes two styles within a single short episode. Mood is controlled as characters' speeches move from prose to verse according to their dramatic functions. In *The Fatal Dowry*, for example, the rapacious creditors' colloquialisms are juxtaposed with Charalois' noble verse. With the creditors, verse is virtually indistinguishable from prose.<sup>4</sup> Their oaths and their constant questions give an air of spontaneity whereas Charalois' tones are more measured, as befits the solemnity of the moment when he says farewell to his soldiers. The solemn figure of the priest and Charalois' followers grouped in silence to receive their gifts add an important dimension to the scene. Spectator responses are manipulated here through shifts in register and tone.

- 1 *Creditor* Slid, Sir, what would yee, y'are so cholericke?  
 2 *Creditor* Most souldiers are so yfaith, let him alone:  
 They have little else to live on, we have not had  
 A penny of him, have wee?  
 3 *Creditor* Slight, wo'd you have our hearts?  
 1 *Creditor* We have nothing but his body heere in durance  
 For all our mony.  
*Priest* On.  
*Charlois* One moment more,  
 But to bestow a few poore legacyes,  
 All I have left in my dead fathers rights,  
 And I have done. Captaine, weare thou these spurs  
 That yet ne're made his horse runne from a foe.  
 Lieutenant, thou, this scarfe, and may it tye  
 Thy valour, and thy honestie together:  
 For so it did in him. Ensigne, this Curace,  
 Your Generalls necklace once. You gentle Bearers,  
 Devide this purse of gold, this other, strow  
 Among the poore: tis all I have.  
 ....  
 For me, my portion provide in Heaven:  
 My roote is earth'd, and I a desolate branch  
 Left scattered in the high way of the world,  
 Trod under foot, that might have bin a Columne,  
 Mainely supporting our demolish'd house.

(*Fatal Dowry*, II.1.102,123)

On other occasions Field uses a deliberately over-inflated rhetoric to guide and control spectator responses. Bellafront's letter declaring undying love for Scudmore is a case in point.

Sooner shall Starres from this Circumference,  
Drop like False Fierie exhalation,  
Then I be false to vowes made vnto thee.

(*Weathercock*, I.1.19)

Alerted by the artifice of her expression we soon find that Bellafront is as false as her language. Nevill, Scudmore's friend, reads her letter while the lover rhapsodizes about her.

*Scud.* ...For Graecians lute  
Was rusticke Musicke to her heavenly tongue,  
Whose sweetnesse e're cast slumbers on mine eies,  
Soft as Content, yet would not let me sleepe.  
*Nev.* *Yours through the world and to the end of time;*  
*Bellafront*  
Which *Bellafront*? Rich Sir *John Worldlies* Daughter?  
*Scud.* She is the food, the sleepe, the aire I live by.  
*Nev.* O heaven! We speake like Goddes, and do like Dogges.  
*Scud.* What means my  
*Nev.* This day, this *Bellafront* the Rich Heire,  
Is married unto Count *Fredericke*,  
And thats the wedding I was going to.

(*Weathercock*, I.1.154)

Scudmore's love rhetoric is undercut by Nevill's bluntness, as contrasting linguistic styles emphasise the moment when the truth about Bellafront emerges. The sudden break in rhythm, Scudmore's interrupted speech and Nevill's patient explanation all add to the comic effect. This is living dialogue.

Stages in the Widow/Bould relationship, described earlier, are



similarly marked by changes in style, from the prosy Princox to the confident, assertive Bould. The fluid easy verse of the second encounter between the Widow and Bould contrasts with their earlier prose scene: a linguistic marker that Bould has now shed his disguise.

*Widow* I would spend all the night to sit and talk w'ee,  
If I durst trust you, I do love you so,  
My bloud forsakes my heart now you depart.

*Bould* S'hart, will you marrie me hereafter then?

*Widow* No, you are too yong, and I am much too old;  
I and unworthy, and the world will say  
We married not for love, goodmorrow servant.

(*Amends*, IV.1.131)

The extra metrical 'No', the stressed 's'hart' and the abbreviated 'w'ee' all add to the illusion of real people conversing, an impression confirmed by the irregularity of the blank verse. Mood, pace and tone are further controlled by a shift in language as Bould reverts to a forceful colloquial prose after the exit of the Widow. His prose is quite different from that he used as Mistress Princox

#### *Exit Widow*

*Bould.* Why so? these women are the erranst Iuglers in the  
World; the wry leg'd fellow is an Asse to 'em. Well I  
must have this widdow, what e're come on't...

(*Amends*, IV.1.139)

His bluntness coupled with the topical allusion, his direct question and his use of 'Well' all seem openly to acknowledge the presence of the audience and to draw them into complicity with him.

In his anxiety to move spectators with impressive rhetoric Field can be led astray. *The Queen of Corinth* has, as I indicated earlier, several passages

which would need very powerful stage action to disguise their absurdity and weakness. There are problems, too, in 'Honour'.

But looke thee *Martius*, not a vein runs here  
from head to foote, but *Sophocles* would unseame, and  
like a spring garden shoot his scornfull blood  
into their eyes durst come to tread on him.

(*Four Plays*, 'Honour', p.26; Waller, p.293)

The totally inappropriate image of a spring garden and the difficult syntax add to the overall absurdity of the idea here. It is an unfortunate moment of weakness in a play which, otherwise, has considerable strengths.

The failure of a passage like this is compounded by its listlessness and its lack of energy. By contrast Duboys in *The Honest Man's Fortune* relishes his situation with sardonic humour

There's no such thriving way to live in grace,  
As to have no sence of it; his backe nor belly  
Shall not want warming that can practise me mischief,  
I walk now with a full purse, grow high and wanton,  
Prune and briske my selfe in the bright shine  
Of his good lordships favours; and for what vertue?  
For fashioning my selfe a murderer.

(*Honest Man's Fortune*, p.157; Waller, II.1, p.231)

When characters are as lively as this contact with spectators works well. Novall Junior in *The Fatal Dowry* is equally energetic in his exuberant defence of his single life.

I marry? were there a Queene oth' world, not I.  
Wedlocke? no, padlocke, horslocke, I weare spurrs  
To keepe it off my heeles; yet my *Aymour*,  
Like a free wanton jennet i'th meddows,  
I looke about, and neigh, take hedge and ditch,  
Feed in my neighbours pastures, picke my choyce  
Of all their faire-maind mares: but married once,



A man is stak'd, or pown'd, and cannot graze  
Beyond his own hedge.

(*Fatal Dowry*, IV.1.70)

The spectators are similarly challenged by Mountferrat's aggression at the splendidly energetic start of *The Knight of Malta*.

*Mount.* Dares she despise me thus? me that with spoil  
And hazardous exploits, full sixteene yeares  
Have led (as handmaides) Fortune, Victory  
Whom the *Maltezi* call my servitors?  
Tempests I have subdude and fought 'em calme,  
Out-lighten'd lightning in my Chivalry  
Rid (tame as patience) billowes that kick'd heaven  
Whistl'd enraged *Boreas* till his gusts  
Were growne so gentle, that he seem'd to sigh  
Because he could not show the ayr my heele...

(*Knight of Malta*, p.71; Waller, I.1, p.79)

The forcefulness of Mountferrat here is well conveyed by the strength of the active verbs and the inverted stress of the opening rhetorical question.

Field's blank verse is competent but rarely outstanding and any judgment on it must be made in the light of my discussion of his use of spectacle, sound and silence in an earlier chapter of this thesis. He is much more confident in handling emotional high points when music and silent action support and amplify his dialogue. It is entirely typical that at the climax of 'Love', for example, Duke Rinaldo finds that

My joy has fill'd me  
Like a full-winded sail: I cannot speak.

(*Four Plays*, 'Love', p.38; Waller, p.332)

Gerrard, challenged to a duel by his dearest friend Ferdinand, can only raise a single word, 'Strange' (*Four Plays*, 'Love', p.319). Leonidas describes

Merione at her discovery of the fatal ring:

Still, still she points,  
And her lips move, but no articulate sound  
Breathes from 'em.

(*Queen of Corinth*, p.14; Waller, III.2, p.48)

Silence replaces dialogue at the reunion of Oriana with Gomera.

Ori. Will you refuse me yet?  
Gom. My wife!  
Val. My sister!  
Gom. Somebody, thank Heaven  
I cannot speak.

(*Knight of Malta*, p.94; Waller, V.2, p.159)

Similar reticence is shown when Strange removes his disguise in *Weathercock*. In such scenes Field seems more comfortable with theatre resources other than language.

Field creates playable characters which need actors to work together to create their effects. His theatre language is a flexible instrument that can be used to express a range of emotions and situations but he is at his best when he uses prose to suggest spontaneity. He captures the familiar diction and colloquial expressions of his spectators and transfers them to the stage in the mouths of characters who are themselves reassuringly familiar. They have just enough individuality to make them interesting to play and entertaining to watch.

Players keep spectators attentive and alert by constant linguistic shifts. In a duologue one character may speak verse, the other prose. There is a constant modulation between the two. Rhyme frequently interrupts



sequences of verse. So scenes rarely settle into predictable rhythms but are broken up with prose and rhyme according to the specific needs of individual characters. Metrical irregularity adds variety in blank verse passages.

From this review of Field's theatre language three factors emerge. Firstly, his prose is, on the whole, more successful than his verse though both are rarely less than competent. He has a wide range of styles appropriate to character and situation and his plays and scenes are constantly varied. Secondly, the staging of his scenes is implicit in his dialogue, needing the living presence of players to reveal the relationship between his characters. Dialogue is his natural mode. Movement accompanies words. Thirdly, many of Field's linguistic strategies operate independently of their declared contexts in his desire to entertain spectators.

## NOTES

1. Robert Weimann, *Shakespeare and the Popular Tradition in the Theatre: Studies in the Social Dimension of Dramatic Form and Function*, edited by Robert Schwartz (Baltimore and London, 1978), p.222.
2. Richard David, *Shakespeare in the Theatre* (Cambridge, 1978), p..6.
3. Peter Davison, *Popular Appeal in English Drama to 1850* (New Jersey, 1982), p.54.
4. Edwards sets out the speeches of the creditors as verse in his edition of *The Fatal Dowry*, but the passage is so metrically unsteady it could as easily be printed as prose.



## CONCLUSION

In his prefatory verse to *The Faithful Shepherdess* Field claims

my ambition is  
 (Even by my hopes and love to Poesie)  
 To live to perfect such a worke as this,  
 Clad in such elegant properietie  
 Of words, including a morallitie  
 So sweete and profitable...<sup>1</sup>

He is sufficiently concerned with his literary reputation to see his independent plays printed and to provide them with skilfully appropriate front matter, including a Latin motto. He makes claims for *A Woman is a Weathercock*

I send a Comedie to you heer as good as I could then make; nor sleight my preseentation, because it is a play: for I tell thee Reader if thou bee'st ignoraunt, a Play is not so ydle a thing as thou art, but a Mirrour of mens lives and actions...<sup>2</sup>

Field, then, has lofty ambition. Yet when he writes his own plays, and collaborates with others, he does not write anything remotely like *The Faithful Shepherdess*, the play he wishes to emulate. He is too much the pragmatist. *The Faithful Shepherdess*, a laudable experiment, failed on stage. Field writes theatre pieces with his eye fixed firmly on the spectator. Despite his extensive experience as an actor in the early plays of Jonson, Marston and Chapman, Field's own work is resolutely non-literary. In this thesis I have examined the strategies he adopts to please the audience: the provision of entertainment and diversion, the display of a range of players' skills, and the presentation of exciting visual and musical effects. I have considered Field's use of theatrical convention and stereotypical characters,



and his tolerant morality. Field is a craftsman: his skill in plotting is one of the few virtues that earlier critics would grant him. And his craft is essentially that of the story teller. John McCormick's comments on Joseph Bouchardy, a playwright writing more than two hundred years after Field, provides a useful perspective when applied to the earlier writer:

As a craftsman he possessed what is today recognised as one of the quintessential qualities of popular theatre: the ability to tell a story in terms to which the popular imagination could relate.<sup>3</sup>

It is in terms of popular entertainment, then, that one can best judge Field's dramatic output.

In his important discussion of the nature of popular theatre, David Mayer offers a series of questions to help define it.

Several affirmative answers to the following queries are enough to indicate that the work in question is popular drama. Is the author unknown? Is the piece the work of more than one author? Is the playwright indifferent to his reputation as a poet? Is the author's identity of little importance to those who announce and present the play? If the author is known, is he known for a style of drama, for sensational scenes, for the use of character types who are amusing in their own right irrespective of the overall unity of the piece? Are plays of this sort favoured over situations that deal with immediate moral and social values in a meaningful way? Does theatrical effect take precedence over literary and artistic conventions.... Does the piece reassure the audience in the validity of traditional values and in the continuity of belief...<sup>4</sup>

The foregoing chapters have shown just how many of Mayer's questions must be answered in the affirmative when they are asked of Field's surviving work. There is only one on his list that might receive a negative answer: 'Is

the playwright indifferent to his reputation as a poet?' - and even here Field's aspirations were not matched by his practice. Affirmative answers to Mayer's first two questions necessitated my attempts to establish Field's canon. It is a commonplace of Elizabethan theatrical history that Mayer's fourth question must also be answered in the affirmative. As we have seen, Field's work contains many examples of character types who are 'amusing in their own right irrespective of the overall unity of the piece' and of 'sensational scenes'. 'Theatrical effect' does take precedence over literary conventions. His work affirms 'the validity of traditional values'. It has a certain moral coherence. In reinforcing and celebrating the bonding qualities within society; friendship, filial duty, loyalty, honesty and so on, Field appears to and defends the values of his spectators. His view of human nature seems to be basically optimistic. He is 'sanguine and traditional' rather than 'melancholic and satiric', to use a distinction proposed nearly forty years ago by Muriel Bradbrook.<sup>5</sup>

Louis James usefully supplements Mayer's list of defining criteria, and encapsulates my feelings about Field as a writer for the popular theatre when he writes

Popular drama can be at once clichéd and professionally expert, escapist and relating to deeper levels of audience experiences, ephemeral yet able to capture our attention with moments of complete conviction.<sup>6</sup>

This thesis has analyzed in detail the characteristics of Field's dramatic output and his theatre craft. They are those of the popular theatre. He is as dependent on the visual as later theatre forms are. David Bradby could be writing of Field's work when he states that the success of Victorian melodramas



lay in their ability to elaborate a complex system of visual signs, thus creating a theatre language that was more than the mere words of the text.<sup>7</sup>

As I have shown Field is at his best when engaged in this kind of pictorial story telling.

Popular drama has always depended on spectacle, song and dance, spiced with topical references and local allusions. When, for example, the Comedie Italienne needed to broaden its appeal and attract wider audiences in France these were the elements they added.<sup>8</sup> And these elements, as I have demonstrated, are crucial to Field's work. In pantomime and melodrama it is necessary, as Bernard Sharratt points out, to 'see through the character to the actor'.<sup>9</sup> Field is a master of this complex interplay between player and role.

Field's plays and scenes, then, have many of the characteristics of popular theatre. In their variety, their opportunities for virtuoso performance, their provision of music and spectacle and, above all, in their relationship with the spectators, they can take their place alongside the later theatre forms of melodrama and farce.

Like these and numerous other examples of popular entertainment, Field's plays would probably fail Brian Gibbons' test of 'important' plays: that they should constitute 'intelligent and moral criticism of society'.<sup>10</sup> His output is not responsive to extended literary analysis. In this he is closer to Heywood and Dekker, than to Jonson, Chapman or Marston. It is largely for this reason that I think Brinkley and Peery are equally unconvincing in their respective attempts to assign Field's work to the literary schools of Jonson and Chapman. Brinkley, building on the Drummond reference to their special relationship, argues that Field's unaided plays were influenced by Jonson's in their satiric aims, their plot construction and their realistic presentation of

contemporary life. She suggests that Field's characterization is based on Jonson's use of 'humours' (Brinkley, pp.72-77). Peery, by contrast, dismisses Jonson as an influence and argues for Chapman, who was, of course, responsible for some of the front matter to *A Woman is a Weathercock*. Peery's reasoning, however, is based on biography rather than style.<sup>11</sup> It is true that Field had probably acted in at least ten of Chapman's plays but they seem to have had little influence over his own output, neither the independent plays considered by Peery and Brinkley nor his wider canon. An examination of Field's treatment of female characters, for example, shows just how different he is from both Jonson and Chapman. He does not fit into any literary school.

As an actor, Field had in his performance repertoire many precedents for savage attacks on women but it is a critical misreading, repeated by Bayne and Brinkley, that Field writes anti-feminist plays.<sup>12</sup> In this he is unlike both Chapman and Jonson. Chapman's women are presented very harshly. The heroines of *The Widow's Tears* are, for example, notoriously inconstant. When Tamyra in *Bussy D'Ambois* refuses the amorous advances of Monsieur he claims that she is acting not from virtue but from indifference -

... so do all  
The common sex of you when y'are encountered  
With one ye cannot fancy.<sup>13</sup>

(*Bussy D'Ambois*, II.2.72)

Monsieur is rapidly proved right, since Tamyra's constancy fails the very next time it is put to the test. Ben Jonson is no kinder. In *Epicoene*, a play Field was acting in at about the same time as he was writing *A Woman is a Weathercock*, all the women are reductively presented, with their concern for fashion and appearance, their extravagance, their gossip and their



incessant noise.<sup>14</sup> The picture of the collegiates in their need to dominate is entirely unattractive. The most damning aspect of the treatment of women in this bitter comedy lies in the resolution of its plot. The only way to achieve a silent woman, claims Jonson, is to make her a man in disguise.

In contrast, Field's attitude to, and treatment of, women in his plays is positively affirmative. Ronald Huebert describes the typical heroine of the period:

She may take the form of a wife betrayed, a mistress discarded, or a virgin scorned, but she is always a woman cut loose from her social moorings and set adrift in a vortex of pathos. Typically she is the victim of collaboration between a repressive social system and an aggressive male ego....<sup>15</sup>

Field's women are far from passive victims. The fiercely independent heroine of *The Honest Man's Fortune*, for example, states her position clearly and admirably

Command and liberty now waite upon  
My Virgin state; what could I more? change all,  
And for a husband? no; these freedoms die,  
In which they live with my Virginitie;  
Tis in their choice that's rich to be a wife,  
But not being yoked to chuse the single life.

(*Honest Man's Fortune*, p.159; Waller, III.1, p.236)

Field's resourceful heroines determine their own fates. Unfaithful women like Bellafront in *A Woman is a Weathercock* or Beaumelle in *The Fatal Dowry* are presented compassionately, and the Moorish servant of *The Knight of Malta* is also allowed a certain sympathy. The plays are peopled with forceful women defending their chastity with spirit. One thinks, for example, of Dorigen, Kate and Grace. The Wife, Lady Orleans and Oriana all pass the tests set for them with exemplary constancy and patience. Bayne

commends Field for realising in *Amends for Ladies*

an ideal of incorruptible and unassailable virtue which was rare in the drama of the period.

(Bayne, p.251)

Bayne is here thinking of Field in the context of Jonson, Chapman, Marston and Middleton. Such women are less rare in Heywood or Dekker, or, indeed, in Shakespeare.

Field writes excellent female roles. The emphasis placed on them may be a result of his choice of genres. Like other popular entertainers he is biassed in favour of comedy and tragi-comedy. I do not think that this should be dismissed as arbitrary, dependent on the accidents of survival, or of attribution. Almost all of Field's surviving work is comic or tragicomic; only *The Fatal Dowry* is an exception.<sup>16</sup> Field is capable of writing for an academic or courtly audience - passionate tragedy, elegant formal debates, courtly masques all find a place in his work - but he cannot resist comedy. Even his serious scenes are informed with moments in which humour lightens and relaxes - sometimes too much so - the potentially tragic tensions. I am thinking, for example, of the Norandine interventions in his scenes of *The Knight of Malta*, his treatment of Agenor in *The Queen of Corinth*, the creditor scenes in *The Honest Man's Fortune* and the bawdy exchanges of parts of *The Fatal Dowry*.

There are, I think, two essentially pragmatic reasons for Field's preferences. One has to do with the very nature of comedy, the other with the fact that Field was a player writing for known actors. First, as W.D.Howarth succinctly puts it, the effect of comedy is

to reinforce our acceptance of a viable social order, a norm of behaviour based on an unwritten compact between the playwright and his audience...<sup>17</sup>



A unifying feature of Field's work is, as we have seen, its tendency to familiarise and to reassure. Moral judgments are subordinated to an acceptance of life's foolishness. Arnold Hare has described

that positive, life affirming quality of comedy, the manner in which it induces enjoyment and acceptance of vagaries, the follies, the foibles, the iniquities, the eccentricities, the absurdities of humanity, as a result of which we emerge more reconciled to the stresses of life...<sup>18</sup>

Field is a tolerant playwright. Second, Field as an actor is someone with a particular interest in the special relationship between player and spectator generated by comic playing. Successful actor-playwrights have on balance tended to favour comedy: David Garrick, Noel Coward and Alan Ayckbourn immediately come to mind. This may be, at least in part, because, as Northrop Frye explains,

the invitation to the audience to form part of the comic society would seem rather out of place at the end of a tragedy. The resolution of comedy comes, so to speak, from the audience's side of the stage.<sup>19</sup>

It is also because many of the satisfactions of comedy are to do with the controlling craft of the actor. Peter Hall, reflecting on responses to Ayckbourn's *Bedroom Farce* in performance, notes that for the actors these satisfactions are 'manipulative rather than sharing a feeling'.<sup>20</sup> The involvement is direct between actor and spectator. The overtly manipulative craftsmanship of Field's dramatic output shows a player's concern for spectators and performance. For the spectators too are responsible for the successful performance of comedy. It is not only that they

enjoy being manipulated by the actors: their knowledge of convention becomes part of the play, as, for example, when they do not take too seriously bars to the inevitable comic resolution. Since the happy ending is guaranteed, the interest lies in seeing just how ingeniously problems will be solved. Scott emphasises that in this context

Familiarity does not breed contempt...[but] a pleasurable ability to predict and a relaxed assurance that favourite events are going to occur.

(Scott, p.20)

This sense of assurance is typical of all popular forms. Writers of melodrama, farce and domestic comedy - recent terms for old elements - create new work, as Bernard Beckerman points out by 'variations that fuse novelty with the comfortably known'.<sup>21</sup>

The same popular characteristic of fusing the familiar with the new underlies the choice of settings for many of Field's plays. For him even the exotic and the historical become familiar and predictable. Athens and Rome, Corinth, Dijon and Milan all provide settings for his stories, and there is very little differentiation among them. None of his collaborative plays has any 'significant' setting. Field is no more concerned with the developed topography of these places than the soap opera *Dallas* is with the detailed geography of Texas. Location and topography are largely accidental or arbitrary, selected to provide the glamour of continental Europe. The remote, fictional world of the stage provides a predictable background for exciting happenings - suitably non-English locations for added glamour and plausibility. Like the heads on Corinth bridge in *The Queen of Corinth* the settings of Field's plays and scenes combine familiarity and novelty. An example of how closely Field responds to a sense of locality is provided by *The Knight of Malta*. In the two plays set in Malta by Elizabethan writers,



the use made of the island differs considerably. The Malta of Marlowe's *Jew* is, as Clifford Leech explains, 'a shrunken world' which can be 'ludicrous'

...Christians and Turks and Jews are alike small, engaged in petty matters of profit and individual murder and the ransoming of a small Mediterranean island.<sup>22</sup>

Malta, in *The Jew*, is narratively, topographically and thematically significant. In Field's section of *The Knight* the island supplies the background for the Order of St John - the setting an excuse for the extensive ceremonial, as the Order itself gives the piece coherence. The escapism implicit in its invitation to spectacle is another factor which aligns Field's dramatic output with popular tradition.

(ii)

It must be clear from all that I <sup>a</sup>h<sub>Λ</sub>ve said so far that I have a high regard for Field as a theatre practitioner. This cannot, however, be tested empirically: his plays do not form part of the contemporary repertoire. Their performance history is virtually blank. So in my evaluation of Field I <sup>a</sup>h<sub>Λ</sub>ve had to be much more dependent on the ephemeral and accidental historical material available than, ideally, I should have liked. Extensive experience in the theatre as spectator and as director, however, gives one some sort of instinct for what will work on stage. I am reminded here of Michael Goldman's formula that 'the defining component of theatrical writing is subtextual life', and of his description of 'the felt presence of something added by the actor both to and through the text'.<sup>23</sup> In reading any Field text I have been particularly struck by the truth of this.

An interesting, intermediate perspective on the plays' qualities as theatre pieces can be gained from an examination of the little evidence that survives of the only known performances of his work.

*Four Plays in One* and *The Queen of Corinth* do not seem to have been played in the Restoration period, though the latter was included, with *The Knight of Malta* and *The Honest Man's Fortune*, in a catalogue of plays 'allowed of his Mates<sup>↑</sup> Servants at ye New Theatre' in 1668. Nathan Field had appeared in *The Knight of Malta* where he was at King's, and the play may have been presented at court in or around 1619, since it is listed on a scrap of paper from the Revels Office. Purcell is thought to have written the music for a later performance of the same play but there are no details.<sup>24</sup> It was also performed in April, 1783 at Covent Garden 'with alterations' by Leonard McNally. The afterpiece on this occasion was *The Ghost, or the Devil to do about her*. Unfortunately McNally's version is not extant, but one can gain some idea of the emphasis placed on the play by two factors. First, the subtitle to the piece was *The Humorous Dane*. A notable comedian, John Quick, chose the part of Norandine for his benefit. Second, the play was advertised to draw attention to its spectacle and music.

To conclude with a Representation of the Ceremony of receiving  
a knight of the Order of Malta, The Music by Dr Arne..<sup>25</sup>

One may infer, then, that McNally in choosing *The Knight of Malta* as a basis for his entertainment, is responding to the opportunities it provides for comic playing and for spectacular ceremonial, both aspects of the original to which Field made the major contribution. This was, of course, unacknowledged. The 'mainpiece' was advertised as the work of Beaumont and Fletcher.

Later, in August of the same year, this time at the Haymarket, 'The



Triumph of Honour' from *Four Plays in One* was performed as part of a programme of popular entertainment. Other items included two newish plays, *The Dead Alive*, with songs by Cadell, and *the Receipt Tax* by J. Stockdale. There was also a 'comical burlesque' called *Chrononhotonthologis, King of Queerumania*

being the most Comical Tragedy that ever was Tragedized by any  
Comical Company of Tragedians

This included processions and a great deal of music so the choice of 'Honour' seems appropriate. The programme was repeated at the Haymarket in the following week, when *The Receipt Tax* was replaced by James Brown Williamson's *The Lawyer* (London Stage<sup>Vol. I</sup>, Part V, p.627-28).

*The Fatal Dowry* has also proved a profitable source of derivative entertainments. In addition to Nicholas Rowe's *The Fair Penitent*, astonishingly popular throughout the eighteenth century, there are at least two other versions; Aaron Hill's *The Insolvent; or, Filial Piety* and Richard Shiel's *The Fatal Dowry*.<sup>26</sup> By examining what happens to the text when it is adapted and/or played in a different context one can go some way to discovering its essential qualities as entertainment, and can place Field and Massinger's play in perspective.

*The Fatal Dowry's* chief appeal seems to lie in its plot. It is this that Rowe borrows<sup>r</sup> for *The Fair Penitent*, though he starts the play with the original Act II, compressing the Act I material into retrospective narrative. Aaron Hill replaced Act V with one of his own, but otherwise follows Field and Massinger pretty closely. His play, *The Insolvent*, was performed at the Haymarket in 1748, with a prologue spoken by Mr Cibber, appropriately enough dressed in mourning for his father (London Stage, p.651). The Preface to the printed edition of the play explains that

Mr Hill almost new wrote the whole; and the last act was entirely his, in conduct, sentiment, diction &c.

(Preface, p.333)

This is in fact an overstatement for the changes are less extensive than the Prologue indicates. They affect chiefly the character of Amelia (Field and Massinger's Beaumelle). She becomes the innocent victim of Young Aumele (Novall Junior), and is consequently a less complex character. All the bawdy disappears as the manipulative and elegant Florella replaces Florimel and Bellapert, Beaumelle's lively waiting women. The result is a blandness of tone compared with the energy of Field's original. The hero of the piece is 'Count Chalons, son of the Marshall of Burgundy'. Romont becomes, as the *Dramatis Personae* of the new play has it, 'La Foy, his friend, a rough soldier'. Hill retains the foreign setting. Much of the language of the original survives, though perhaps not as closely as Frank Kermode in his note on the play suggests.<sup>27</sup> A brief comparison between the ways the funeral scenes are handled is instructive here. Field, the practical actor, writes an extended, fully detailed direction for the funeral entry and then the hero speaks:

*Charalois* How like a silent streame shaded with night,  
And gliding softly with our windy sighes  
Moves the whole frame of this solemnity!  
Teares sighes and blackes, filling the simily,  
Whilst I the only murmur in this grove  
Of death, thus hollowly break forth.

(*Fatal Dowry*, II.1.48)

After a brief stage direction, *Enter Funeral attended by Chalons and La Foy &c*, Hill transfers the description of the funeral procession to La Foy (Romont), the hero's friend.



How like a silent stream, by nights dark brow  
O'er shaded, gliding under still cold shows  
Moves the slow march of that sad solemn train!  
Tears, sighs and mournful black but paint woe's face,  
Within lies all the depth that drowns distress.

(*The Insolvent*, p.346)

In the original Charalois addresses the soldiers directly

Peace, O peace, this sceane is wholly mine.  
What, weepe ye souldiers? Blanch not.

(*Fatal Dowry*, II.1.74)

Hill echoes this, as Chalons (Charalois) says

Alas! the mournful scene is wholly mine.  
The honest soldiers weep! La Foy too weeps.

(*The Insolvent*, p.346)

The two situations are parallel, with the funeral processions, the weeping soldiers and the protagonist's insistence on his own important role. What Hill is taking from Field here is his theatricality - the structural composition of the 'slow march of that sad solemn train' and the self conscious awareness of the protagonist of his role in the drama. What is missing, though, in Hill's version is Field's immediacy, as both the account of the funeral procession and the address to the weeping soldiers are transferred into the descriptive third person narrative.

Some sixty years later Richard Shiel adapted *The Fatal Dowry* for William Macready. Field's contribution remained unacknowledged. In the Prologue to the Drury Lane performance in January 1825 the spectators were

adjured to reject Rowe's version, *The Fair Penitent*,

Drawn feebly from our great original,  
With laboured phrase and specious eloquence.

and to

Approve the earlier and the master hand:  
True taste at once and Massinger restore  
And give the Stage one classic drama more.

But again alterations had been made. As Macready explained in his *Reminiscences*,

the original work is one of great power, but unhappily disfigured by scenes too gross for presentation before an audience making pretension to any degree of refinement. Shiel undertook the task of its purification and in its adaptation, whilst maintaining the strictest fidelity to the story, substituted scenes which, in energy, passion and dramatic power, fully equalled those on which they were grafted.<sup>28</sup>

The play was well acted and 'enthusiastically applauded', and was equally successful when Macready played it in America, and when Samuel Phelps revived it twenty years later at Sadlers Wells. Macready obviously enjoyed the histrionic opportunities provided by the part of Romont, as he employed 'some of his extraordinary sinkings and transitions of voice' to remarkable effect.<sup>29</sup>

*Amends for Ladies* has no performance history after its initial showing at Rosseter's Blackfriars. *A Woman is a Weathercock* has fared only slightly better. Since its first performance 'before the king in Whitehall', and its successful appearance, according to Downes, in the 1667-8 season at Lincoln's Inn Fields there is no evidence of any performance before the twentieth century. It was considered for court performance on the same



1619 list as *The Knight of Malta* but, unlike that play, was deleted (Marcham, p.15). So Patrick Kirwan's inclusion of *A Woman is a Weathercock* in the Stratford season of 1914 was quite unprecedented.<sup>30</sup> Kirwan wanted to 'broaden the Elizabethan atmosphere of the festival' that year, and so he chose two plays

to help us to place Shakespeare in his position among his contemporaries, and to judge his age from a medium other than his plays...<sup>31</sup>

To the seven Shakespearian comedies and *Hamlet* which formed the nucleus of the 1914 season, Kirwan, therefore, added Henry Porter's *Two Angry Women of Abington* and Nathan Field's *A Woman is a Weathercock*.

The *Birmingham Daily Mail* had been worried that *A Woman is a Weathercock*, like *Amends for Ladies* would be unsuitable for a modern audience:

Some of the dialogue is too coarse for modern ears except perhaps at a fashionable West End theatre.<sup>32</sup>

Kirwan clearly agreed and doctored his text accordingly. His demands for Elizabethan authenticity did not survive pre-war prudery. Having chosen *A Woman is a Weathercock* to reflect Shakespeare's age he proceeded to cut some of the characteristically robust scenes which would have allowed him to do so. Kirwan's reasons are revealing:

the sub plot was simply Hogarthian work introduced as appealing to the groundlings and the pruning-knife had been employed on all the matter which was introduced for the sole purpose of making the play pay...<sup>33</sup>

'Coarseness' is a quality of Field's work which early critics disliked, but it is central to him. He could never resist sexual innuendo nor bawdy word play. *A Woman is a Weathercock's* sub-plot, involving the duping of the foolish Sir Abraham by Wagtail and Pendant, is one of the great strengths of the play.

Kirwan's production was nevertheless a success. Stanley Howlett, 'a young actor who is particularly fitted for romantic parts' and Miss Hayward, 'with emotional power to an unusual extent', were much praised as Scudmore and Bellafront, and *The Standard's* reviewer concluded:

The audience at the theatre this evening was a typically popular crowd, who took the Elizabethan note of the play in good part, and responded to the humour and romance of the situation with equal appreciation.<sup>34</sup>

These comments suggest that judgment of the *Birmingham Daily Mail* before the event

...few of the characters are sympathetic and the serious lines of Belforest [sic] and Scudmore, the leading characters, suggest rhetoric rather than passion...<sup>35</sup>

was not confirmed in performance. Contact with spectators and playable roles are hallmarks of Field. *The Times's* reviewer summed up his appreciation of all the performances, including Basil Sydney's 'thoroughly useful Nevill' and Stanley Howlett's 'fitly imaginative reading of Scudmore' but what pleased him best was the way that Mr Harry Gribble as Sir Abraham Ninny had 'found his way...to his audience's heart'.<sup>36</sup> C.C.Stopes picked out for praise

the Count himself, a little man, made up of wealth, clothes, vanity and adulation, shallow, conceited (but genuine)



...delightfully rendered by Mr Wenlock-Brown

She

He contrasted the success of Field's play with the failure of Porter's.

There was no passion but anger in the Abingdon [sic] play; no characters but the angry women; the others were superficial shows of character, with nothing real to rivet attention. When we turn to this second play we at once realise something different...there is a sense of reality in the people, a truth in characterization, which reminds us at times of Shakespeare.

She

He goes on to commend Stanley Howlett's Scudmore, Sir Abraham Ninny 'of the School of Slander, more highly educated, better dressed' and Captain Pouts 'in all his stages of effrontery and Pistol-like cowardice'. It is satisfying to note that Robert Noble, playing Pouts was also cast as Don John in *Much Ado About Nothing*, a part it so much resembles. Stopes ends <sup>her</sup> his review with the useful comment:

All ends well, and the play makes us think. There is life in it, there is character in it...<sup>37</sup>

Clearly Field writes performable roles which players can enjoy playing and spectators watching.

R.T.Rundle Milliken was disappointed that 'the author's female-hating aptitude goes for nothing' - unsurprisingly, since it does not exist.<sup>38</sup> Lilian Hall, a reviewer for *The Stratford-upon-Avon Herald*, commended Field's gift for story-telling, and his provision of exciting stage moments:

...the scene of the wedding procession is effective with one despairing lover as a spectator and another bringing an accusation against the honour of the second bride.

She ended her article with further comment on 'the great variety of incidents

all in the course of one day.'<sup>39</sup>

*A Woman is a Weathercock* was thought by one critic to be 'a strange combination of melodrama and farce'.<sup>40</sup> Another commented on its 'boisterous and extravagant comedy' and on its farce and burlesque'.<sup>41</sup> A third spoke of farcical scenes intervening 'between highly dramatic slices of sentiment and romance'.<sup>42</sup> Once again one observes that it is to the terminology of popular entertainment that reviewers naturally turn to describe Field's work.

This review of Field's brief performance history illustrates, albeit patchily, his strengths and weaknesses. The emphasis on ceremony and spectacle, the humour, the varied, carefully crafted narrative and the provision of good acting parts all receive comment, as does Field's fondness for bawdy and scenes 'too gross for presentation'. With shifts in taste the latter should not now be a bar to production. Indeed, I see Field's handling of sexual humour as refreshing and as one of his successes.

Despite this, however, there would still be difficulties in mounting many of Field's plays. By their very nature popular theatre pieces are ephemeral: the more successfully they relate to the topicalities and conventions of their time the less immediately they can appeal to later audiences. They are products of the theatre for which they are conceived. So, with two or three notable exceptions, the relationship of an unknown play by Field with its modern audience would be different. To twentieth century spectators brought up on the rich poetic language of Marlowe, Jonson or Shakespeare, or the macabre and tragic world view of Tourneur and Webster, for example, Field's genial plays and scenes with their topical and topographical references, their rootedness in convention and their 'significant' visual pictures would seem unfamiliar and difficult to read: the antithesis of their original effect. Outside their original courtly context, and



without adaptation, I doubt that 'Love' or 'Honour' would be successful, and the full composite programme of all *Four Plays* would be very demanding to stage. The conventions of triumph and masque are no longer available to us - and without these there is insufficient in *Four Plays* as a whole to sustain interest. Perhaps one could take the one act plays out of their courtly framework, but it is difficult to envisage a context for such a performance and much of the metatheatrical playfulness, the source of the entertainment's strength, would be lost.<sup>43</sup>

Field's comedies are rooted in their locality and their immediate conventions. *Amends for Ladies* and *The Honest Man's Fortune* are both excellent plays but modern productions would miss essential elements. The recent RSC production of *Epicoene* showed just how difficult it is to stage a play so dependent on the neutrality of all male casting. Without 'boy actresses' the cross dressing of Honour, Bould, Franck and Feesimple in *Amends for Ladies* or the exploitation of this convention at the end of *The Honest Man's Fortune* would lose much of their effect. So while both plays offer a range of well differentiated roles, strong relationships and exciting, fast moving stories I do not think they could be fully successful in a twentieth century revival.

By contrast, I think *A Woman is a Weathercock* would still play well. It fully deserves Bridges Adams's rather grudging praise - 'it is excellent actors' stuff'.<sup>44</sup> Its well crafted plots have pace and variety. Its modulations of mood are skilfully controlled. Its characters are well defined and individualised. It is funny.

*The Knight of Malta* could also be successfully performed today. Strong characters, humour and exciting story line combine with spectacle and with a liveliness in the writing to make a very actable piece. Despite some difficulties with its time scheme I should like to see it played, as it has energy and the coherent overall shape so lacking in *The Queen of Corinth*. Despite

one superb scene by Field, the latter ultimately fails because of a certain lassitude in the characterization and a too stagey remoteness in its narrative and plot resolution. Peter Hall, writing of the failure of Noel Coward's later work, reflects that there was

too much show business camp, I suppose. You can't live off the theatre. It's imitation. There needs to be some life to imitate in your work

(*Peter Hall's Diaries*, p.276)

The same is true of *The Queen of Corinth*. *The Fatal Dowry*, even in these feminist days, has a great deal to offer the actors, though its ending might be thought clumsily over explicit and contrived. But the vigour of the confrontational scenes, the sympathetic treatment of its heroine, and its provision of spectacle make it still viable.

In the introduction to this thesis I identified several reasons by Nathan Field's work as a playwright had been so neglected. Two of these stood out: the preferences of early critics for literary rather than theatrical values, and the shifting incoherent nature of the canon itself. The first has been solved by time. In the last few years there has been a change of emphasis so that the examination of performance pieces has now a respectable scholarly history to parallel that of literary analysis. I have tried in this thesis to provide help in solving the second by endeavouring to establish, however tentatively, what Field wrote, and by looking at his dramatic output with a view to its overall coherence. The factor which unifies all Field's plays and scenes is the excellence of his theatre craft. A constant awareness of their professional context informs his writing. Alan Ayckbourn draws attention to a vital fact, in recalling Stephen Joseph's criteria for judging new plays:



He would always emphasise that the dramatist, in the last analysis, was serving the actor, which I think is right - eventually the audience, whether they like it or not, are watching the actor and not the dramatist.<sup>45</sup>

Field writes for actors. He is a more than competent provider of entertainment. I make no great claims for him as a theatre poet, but as a skilful theatre practitioner he is worth more attention than he has so far received. One can say of Field's plays what Eliot said of Heywood's: they would be 'excellent fun when played'.<sup>46</sup> It is a pity that more of them have not been given the test of production. There are plenty of plays in the repertoire that are worse than *A Woman is a Weathercock*, *The Knight of Malta* or *The Fatal Dowry*. As he himself says

I have been vexed with vile playes myselfe, a great while,  
hearing many, nowe I thought to be even with some, and they  
should heare mine too.<sup>47</sup>

## NOTES

1. Nathan Field, 'To my lov'd Friend M. John Fletcher, on his Pastorall', prefatory verse to John Fletcher, *The Faithful Shepherdess*, edited by Cyrus Hoy, in Bowers, III, 483-612 (p.489).
2. 'To the Reader', *A Woman is a Weather-Cocke*, Q.1612, sig. [A3v].
3. John McCormick, 'Joseph Bouchardy: a melodramatist and his public', in *Performance and Politics in Popular Drama*, edited by David Bradby, Louis James and Bernard Sharratt (Cambridge, 1980), pp.33-48 (p.45).
4. David Mayer, 'Towards a Definition of Popular Theatre', in *Western Popular Theatre*, edited by David Mayer and Kenneth Richards (London and New York, 1977), pp.257-77 (pp.264-5).
5. Muriel Bradbrook, *Growth and Structure of Elizabethan Comedy*, new edition (New York, 1973), p.119.
6. Louis James, 'Introduction' in *Performance and Politics in Popular Drama*, pp.1-2 (p.2).
7. David Bradby, 'Introduction' in *Performance and Politics in Popular Drama*, pp.167-72 (p.167).
8. Virginia P. Scott, 'The *Jeu* and the Role: Analysis of the Appeals of the Italian Comedy in France in the Time of Arlequin-Dominique', in *Western Popular Theatre*, pp.1-27 (p.6).
9. Bernard Sharratt, 'The politics of the popular? - from melodrama to television', in *Performance and Politics in Popular Drama*, pp.275-95 (p.282).
10. Brian Gibbons, *Jacobean City Comedy, A Study of Satiric Plays by Jonson, Marston and Middleton* (1968), second edition (London and New York, 1980), p.89.
11. William Peery, 'Nid Field was whose Scholar?', *Shakespeare Association Bulletin*, 21 (1946), 80-86; 'The influence of Ben Jonson on Nathan Field', *Studies in Philology*, 43 (1946), 482-97.
12. Ronald Bayne, 'Lesser Jacobean and Caroline Dramatists', in *Cambridge History of English Literature*, edited by A.W.Ward and A.R.Waller, reprinted 15 vols (Cambridge, 1932-3), VI, 210-40; Brinkley, p.77.
13. George Chapman, *The Widow's Tears*, edited by Akihiro Yamada, *The Revels Plays* (Manchester, 1975); *Bussy D'Ambois*, edited by Nicholas Brooke, *The Revels Plays* (London, 1964), reprinted (Manchester, 1979).
14. Ben Jonson, *Epicoene*, edited by R.V.Holdsworth, *New Mermaids* (London, 1979).
15. Ronald Huebert, '"An Artificial Way to Grieve": The forsaken woman in Beaumont and Fletcher, Massinger and Ford', *ELH*, 44 (1977), 601-21 (p.601).



16. The lost *The Jeweller of Amsterdam* was, presumably, a murder play, being based on an actual event.
17. W.D.Howarth, 'Introduction', in *Comic Drama, The European Heritage*, edited by W.D.Howarth (London, 1978), pp.1-21 (p.6).
18. Arnold Hare, 'English Comedy', in *Comic Drama, the European Heritage*, pp.122-43 (p.123).
19. Cited by Howarth, p.2. Northrop Frye, *The Anatomy of Criticism* (Princeton, N.J., 1957), p.164.
20. *Peter Hall's Diaries: The Story of a Dramatic Battle*, edited by John Goodwin (London, 1983), p.285.
21. Bernard Beckerman, *Theatrical Presentation: Performer, Audience and Act*, edited by Gloria Brim Beckerman and William Coco (New York and London, 1990), p.77.
22. Clifford Leech, *Christopher Marlowe, Poet for the Stage*, edited by Anne Lancashire (New York, 1986), p.174.
23. Michael Goldman, 'Performer and Role in Marlowe and Shakespeare', in *Shakespeare and the Sense of Performance: Essays in the Tradition of Performance Criticism in Honour of Bernard Beckerman*, edited by Marvin and Ruth Thompson (Newark, London and Toronto, 1989), pp.91-102 (p.91).
24. Arthur Colby Sprague, *Beaumont and Fletcher on the Restoration Stage*, reissued (New York and London, 1965), pp.122, 29, 52, 67; Frank Marcham, *The King's Office of the Revels: 1610-1622* (London, 1925), p.33.
25. *The London Stage, 1660-1800...*, 12 vols (Carbondale, Illinois, 1960-1979), V, 605.  
See also Donald J.Rulfs, 'Beaumont and Fletcher on the London Stage, 1776-1833', *PMLA*, 63 (1948), 1245-64.
26. Nicholas Rowe, *The Fair Penitent*, edited by Malcolm Goldstein, Regents Restoration Drama (London, 1969). The play was first played in May, 1703 at Lincoln's Inn Fields. It continued to be very popular throughout the eighteenth century. Between 1647 and 1776, for example, it was played every season bar five, often with as many as five or six performances. Garrick was renowned for his Lothario (Field and Massinger's Novall Junior). Allardyce Nicoll, *A History of English Drama, 1660-1900*, 6 vols. 4th edition (1952-59), II, p.99; *Drury Lane Calendar, 1747-1776*, edited by Dougald Macmillan (Oxford, 1938); Aaron Hill, *The Insolvent; or Filial Piety*, in *The Dramatic Works of A.H.*, 2 vols (London, 1760), II, pp.329-388; Philip Massinger, *The Fatal Dowry: A Tragedy, altered and adapted for representation as performed at the Theatre-Royal, Drury Lane, January 5, 1825* (London, 1825).
27. Frank Kermode, 'A Note on the History of Massinger's *The Fatal Dowry* in the Eighteenth Century', *Notes and Queries*, 192 (1947), 186-87. Kermode refers to *The Fatal Dowry* as 'Massinger's great play' (p.186) and makes the point that Massinger's language survives. The passage



he quotes in support is in fact from Field's Act II.1.

28. William Macready, *Reminiscences and Selections from his Diaries and Letters*, edited by Sir Frederick Pollock, 2 vols. (London, 1875), I, 301.
29. Cited from an unidentified newspaper clipping in the Harvard Theatre Collection by Alan S.Downer, *The Eminent Tragedian: William Charles Macready* (London, 1966), p.72.
30. J.Downes, *Roscius Anglicanus* (1708), edited by Judith Milhous and Robert D.Hume (London, 1987), p.60. For details of Patrick Kirwan's life and career see *The Dramatic List: Who's Who in the Theatre: A Biographical Record of the Contemporary Stage*, compiled and edited by John Parker, fifth edition, revised and enlarged (London, 1925), 528-9; Cary M.Mazer, *Shakespeare Refashioned: Elizabethan Plays on Edwardian Stages* (Michigan, 1981); *The London Stage, 1900-1909, A Calendar of Plays and Players*, edited by J.P.Wearing, 2 vols. (London and New Jersey, 1981). *Weathercock* was performed on 27 April 1914.
31. *Birmingham Gazette*, 20 April 1914. See also *Pall Mall Gazette*, 20 April 1914.
32. *Birmingham Daily Mail*, 21 April 1914.
33. *Stratford-upon-Avon Herald*, 17 April, 1914.
34. *The Standard*, 29 April 1914.
35. *Birmingham Daily Mail*, 21 April, 1914.
36. *The Times*, 28 April 1914
37. *Stratford-upon-Avon Herald*, 1 May, 1914.
38. *Stratford-upon-Avon Herald*, 1 May, 1914.
39. *Stratford-upon-Avon Herald*, , 24 April, 1914.
40. *Birmingham Daily Post*, 20 April, 1914.
41. *Birmingham Daily Mail*, 21 April 1914.
42. *The Standard*, 29 April, 1914.
43. Perhaps they might be possible in an academic environment. The Marlowe Society of Cambridge University, mounted Fletcher's 'The Triumph of Death' from *Four Plays in One* in December, 1920, at the Footlights Theatre. See Harold Child, 'Revivals of English Dramatic Works, 1919-1925', *RES*, II (1926), 177-88 (p.183).
44. W.Bridges Adams, *The Irresistible Theatre: From the Conquest to the Commonwealth* (London, 1957), p.236.
45. Ian Watson, *Conversations with Ayckbourn* (London, 1981), p.20.
46. T.S.Eliot, 'Thomas Heywood', in *Selected Essays*, third edition (London, 1951), pp.171-81 (p.177).



47. 'The Reader', *A Woman is a Weather-Cock*, Q.1612, sig [A3v].

## POSTSCRIPT



## Postscript

Shortly before the date of submission for this thesis, and just as the last chapter was being typed, news reached me that Trampoline, a new professional theatre group, was performing *A Woman is a Weathercock* at the Pentameters Theatre.<sup>1</sup> This pub theatre seats approximately sixty people. Unusually for the fringe, the company is large and well able to deal with the casting demands of the play. The play was performed virtually uncut, in a version of timeless Jacobean costume.

The timing of this production was an extraordinary piece of good fortune, since I was not only able to discuss the play with its director, Graham Watts, but to judge at first hand the impact of one of Field's plays in performance. The production was reviewed by the critics of daily and weekly publications. Irving Wardle hailed the play as 'more than a collector's piece'; Suzi Feay thought it 'a marvellous find'.<sup>2</sup> It was on the whole well received. On the night I attended, the audience, a mixed group of all ages, thoroughly enjoyed themselves. At the end of the run, Graham Watts told me that the production had not, as he had thought, attracted academics or 'theatricals' in particular, but had been sold out every night to ordinary people; those, he said, 'looking for a good night out.' He felt it had been very successful in satisfying those demands.<sup>3</sup>

The play proved to be very actable. It was good to have my dismissal of Field's misogyny earlier in this thesis confirmed by the performance, even though some of the critics missed the point of the way in which the Scudmore/Bellafront scenes were played. Kirsty Milne and Jeremy Kingston complained of 'the misogynist rant of Scudmore' and of the 'anaemic' love scenes 'soured by some stock Jacobean misogyny'.<sup>4</sup> Their views were usefully contradicted by Suzi Feay of *Time Out*. To my mind correctly, she

interpreted the Scudmore/Bellafront encounters as showing that misogyny is 'a negative quality that must be purged if the hero is to redeem himself.' Certainly at the performance I attended, Malcolm Freeman, in his skilful playing of the role, persuaded us to take Scudmore's pain seriously, even as we were laughing at its overblown rhetoric and his foolishness. I did, however, find that Nicola Branson's Bellafront was not as strongly played. The part demands more vocal variety than she employed. It is to this, rather than to weaknesses in direction or writing, that I attribute the adverse comments on these scenes. Scudmore's duologues with Christopher Hawley's vocally adept and supportive Nevill were much more impressive. Nevill mediates our responses to Scudmore and Irving Wardle, for one, found that the play led 'into unexpected and human directions entirely belying the author's misogynistic reputation' (Wardle, *Independent on Sunday*).

Graham Watts also endorsed my point about Field's humane treatment of the women in the play. He had found no trace of misogyny whilst in rehearsal. Indeed he felt that Field's sympathies were all firmly located with the women. 'After all', he said, 'they drive the play.' However, it must be admitted that in this production the men's performances certainly overshadowed the women's, but this was, I think, related to the quality of the performers not the roles.

His experience of exploring the play in rehearsal also gave Graham Watts a high opinion of Field's practical stage-craft. The company worked initially from a text edited by J.P. Collier, but Watts also went back to the original 1612 quarto.<sup>5</sup> He told me that the only times they had any staging difficulties - with for example the timing and ordering of entrances - they were using the edited text. When they worked exactly to Field's stage directions these problems were solved, and certainly they gave me no concern



in the performance I saw. Editing also obscured the help Field gives his actors with the delivery of speeches. Going back to the quarto punctuation had helped in a number of instances of difficulty.

Jeremy Kingston's review for *The Times* drew attention to Field's constructional skill, commenting that he knew 'how to shape a drama and weave three or four plots in a whole'. Suzi Feay enjoyed the play's variety - 'plenty of acrobatics, singing, brawling, masquing and mummery'. Sympathetically acted and directed, the play also had more emotional depth than I expected. Feay obviously liked the production.

It is an enthralling portrait of a society both savage and tender, a poke in the eye to the pompous and well-to-do, and a vindication of love.

(Feay, *Time Out*)

To judge by the enthusiastic responses and applause of the spectators both between scenes and at the end, we shared her favourable opinion. The play was very funny.

The critics were unanimous in praising the play's comedy. Irving Wardle picked out

three excellent comic leads from Paul Ritter [Pendant], Grant Russell [Pouts] and Angus Barnet [Sir Abraham Ninny].

(Wardle, *Independent on Sunday*)

As I had surmised, both Pendant and Pouts make much more impact on the stage than the relative paucity of their lines might lead one to expect. Indeed, Pendant almost stole the show. Attributing Field's strength to 'his comic observation of a scheming underclass' Jeremy Kingston also praised Paul Ritter's Pendant - 'he comes across as a sort of Blackadder with a sour plum in his mouth' (Kingston, *The Times*). Even though the theatre was

small I would have welcomed more attack in the playing - perhaps something less televisual - but Paul Ritter made the satiric content of the role easily accessible to the audience.

The undoubted star of the evening was Angus Barnet 'who maximise[d] the comic potential of his Sir Abraham Ninny'.<sup>6</sup> This 'lolloping young knight' was 'a lovely comic creation, absurd yet unexpectedly revealed to possess courage and principles' (Kingston, *The Times*). Kingston noted another feature of Sir Abraham's that I find characteristic of Field's work - 'a panting eagerness for life that makes him wholly engaging'. Like the Sir Abraham of the 1914 Stratford production, Angus Barnet found 'his way to his audience's heart'.<sup>7</sup> The full house responded audibly to him, sighing as he found it hard to find a rhyme, laughing at its inappropriateness when he did. But I was disappointed in the presentation of Lady Ninny. She was just not large enough in any sense - though the props department had provided her with a splendid double-sized chair. There was more comedy to be extracted here.

*A Woman is a Weathercock* was advertised as 'riproaring' and 'raunchy', but the reviewers did not comment on the bawdiness of the play.<sup>8</sup> This was partly due to the fact that Naomi Sachs as Wagtail was not well cast, her fresh beauty being rather too wholesome and refined. This impression was reinforced by a very demure costume. The production as a whole played down earthiness and bawdy. It was far less sexually provocative than I was expecting. Wagtail had plenty of spirit, but I had looked for something coarser and more physically demonstrative. Her interpretation of the role made the gulling of Sir Abraham more plausible, but perhaps weakened the comic effect of their relationship's incongruity. Nevertheless I enjoyed that scene; and her unholy alliance with Pendant worked well.

The most successful scenes, then, were the comic ones: those in which



the smallness of the acting area did not inhibit the action. The space was limited but well used. Setting the bed into a trap in the raked floor was an excellent idea, as was the use of the passage-ways behind the audience who were seated around the irregularly shaped stage.<sup>9</sup> Eavesdroppers literally overlooked the action from ladders on the auditorium walls. This lessened the opportunities for immediate audience contact, but it was an ingenious solution to the problems of space. So too was the representation of the church door, an elegantly simple white hanging. But the splendour of this scene of spectacle with its music and its processional entry was, necessarily in view of the context, missing. The patterned symmetries of the wedding dance also needed much more space. There is no obvious twentieth-century equivalent for an essentially Jacobean masque and the sequence which ended the play was the least successful on stage. The company supplied all the music live - either sung or played on the recorder.

Another Jacobean concept that did not translate well into a modern equivalent was the casting of Suzy Barton as the Page. It was an interesting experiment to substitute physical for verbal agility, and to represent the Page's licence and wit with acrobatics. But the device did not seem to fit in with the other production values which were largely realistic. It was presumably influenced by the presence in the company of a trained girl gymnast, and the practical difficulties of using a boy player. By contrast, the aggressive realism of the extended fight sequence was a spectacular success, using every inch of the theatre and generating a real sense of danger. At least one child in the audience hid his eyes at this point.

I was surprised that Graham Watts did not capitalise on the intimacy of the theatre space by encouraging his actors to play off the spectators more directly. This seems to me an essential facet of the play. But Malcolm Freeman's Scudmore, for example, spoke his attack on women reflectively and introspectively, rather than picking out individual women in the theatre.

Perhaps this was a safer option! The playing of asides was also muted, only Pendant achieving good eye-contact with spectators.

I first read *A Woman is a Weathercock* some years ago and was immediately struck by its sheer competence as a piece of entertainment. Now, ten years later, and enjoying Graham Watts's production, I find it hugely satisfying to know that I was right. As I have argued throughout this thesis, Field's dramatic output must be judged in its theatre context. I now look forward to Trampoline's projected production of *Amends for Ladies*, potentially an even better play, despite the casting difficulties I discussed in my last chapter.<sup>10</sup> The excellence of Field's theatrecraft has now been recognised by some experienced theatre practitioners. I hope it is not too long before Field's reputation is more widely established in theatrical and scholarly circles.



## Notes

1. *A Woman is a Weathercock* ran from 18 February to 15 March 1992 at the Pentameters Theatre, over the Three Horseshoes Public House in Hampstead, NW3. It was Trampoline's inaugural production.
2. Irving Wardle, *Independent on Sunday*, 23 February 1992; Suzi Feay, *Time Out*, 26 February - 4 March 1992, p.108.
3. In private conversations with me.
4. Kirsty Milne, *Sunday Telegraph*, 23 February 1992; Jeremy Kingston, *The Times*, 22 February 1992.
5. Nathan Field, *A Woman is a Weathercock*, edited by John Payne Collier (1829).
6. Louise Kingsley, *Independent*, 21 February 1992.
7. Harry Gribble as Sir Abraham 'found his way ... to his audience's heart.' *The Times*, 28 April 1914.
8. The adjectives are taken from the poster and the handbill advertising the production, and from a brief article previewing it in *The Independent* 21 February 1992. Simon Tait in *The Times*, 24 January 1992, describes the play as 'roistering'.
9. The stage was a quadrant of a distorted circle; the straight sections were about seven metres long. There were three entrances for the actors, one at each vertex. The designer was Niki Turner.
10. This is scheduled for 1993 as part of a season that includes a new play by Graham Watts about Shakespeare and Field's life as a boy player.

## APPENDIX ONE

### The Portrait



## APPENDIX ONE: The Portrait

Cartwright's bequest to Dulwich College in December 1686 includes a portrait described in the 1680s inventory as 'master feild's pictur in his shurt on a bourd in a black frame filited with gould an Actour'.<sup>1</sup> The identification of this portrait with Nathan Field, though very plausible, is not absolutely secure. First, there is a gap of over sixty years between the compilation of the inventory and the death of the putative sitter. Second, there are other insecure identifications in the inventory. 'Mr Slys pictur ye Actour' (Inventory 109), for example, is almost certainly not a portrait of William Sly.<sup>2</sup> 'Mr burbig his head' (Inventory 105) offers no 'absolute reason' for doubt, but its most recent cataloguer points out that there is no more evidence to support this identification than there is for the traditional assumption that it is a self portrait.<sup>3</sup>

The portrait traditionally though to be Field's cannot be precisely dated. It is usually assigned to 1615 but this is dependent on its identification with Field. At that date he would have been twenty eight, a plausible age for the sitter. The visual evidence is contradictory, pointing to the early 1590s *and* the early 1620s. Costume, hairstyle, iconography and a parallel with a contemporary miniature suggest the earlier date; the background detail of the arched niche, and a further parallel to a 1623 portrait in the National Portrait Gallery the later.<sup>4</sup> If the earlier date is accepted the portrait cannot be Field's: he was born in 1587.

Nonetheless there seems little reason to over throw the traditional attribution, particularly in view of the portrait's provenance. Though the Inventory dates from the 1680s, William Cartwright (born in 1607) has direct, incontrovertible links with the pre-Restoration theatre.<sup>5</sup> He, like his father before him, was an actor. In later adult life he worked largely at the Salisbury

Court and then with the King's Men at Drury Lane. He started out at the Fortune. Both he and his father were co-lessees of that theatre. William Cartwright senior was a close friend and a professional colleague of Edward Alleyn, the founder of Dulwich College, the recipient of the portrait. Geoffrey Ashton suggests that 'Cartwright would not have known Field' but I think it possible that he did (Ashton, p.46). The Cartwrights worked in the same profession in the same area. Field was a very well known actor and, as Ashton points out, 'his image would have been carried into the later seventeenth century by the many people who saw him perform.' (Ashton, p.46). As with so many other aspects of Field's life the verdict has to be not proven.



## NOTES

1. The Inventory, MS XIV in Dulwich College Library, is transcribed in *Mr Cartwright's Pictures: A Seventeenth Century Collection*, Dulwich Picture Gallery (London, 1987), pp.20-27. Field's putative portrait is number 167 in the Inventory and number 27 in *Mr Cartwright's Pictures*. Its Dulwich Picture Gallery number is 385 in G.F.Warner, *Catalogue of Manuscripts and Muniments of Dulwich College* (London, 1881).
2. G[eoffrey] A[shton], Catalogue entry 26, Head of a Man, called William Sly (d.1608), *Mr Cartwright's Pictures*, pp.45-6.
3. Ashton, Catalogue entry 25, Richard Burbage (1573-1619), pp.44-5.
4. Ashton, p.46. Nicholas Hilliard, Man against a Background of Flames (Victoria and Albert Museum, P.5-1917).
5. *Jac. and Car. Stage*, II.403-4.

## APPENDIX TWO

A list of plays considered



## APPENDIX 2: A list of plays considered

The following list has been compiled from the third edition of Annals of English Drama 975-1700. Authors, dates and companies assigned are those given in this publication. I have also consulted E.K.Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage*, G.E.Bentley, *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage* and Yoshiko Kawachi, *Calendar of English Renaissance Drama, 1558-1642* (New York and London, 1986). The arrangement is chronological.

YEAR	AUTHOR(S)	TITLE	LIMITS	COMPANY
1. 1604	Anon (Chapman, G?)	<i>Charlemagne; or, The Distracted Emperor</i>	c.1603-1622	Unknown
2. 1606	Fletcher, J. (with the help of another)	<i>The Noble Gentleman</i>	c.1605-6 extant version 1625 lic.3 Feb.1626	Kings' revised Fletcher
3. 1607	Marston, J; Barksted W.	<i>The Insatiate Countess</i>	1607-8 rev.1609-13	Queen's Revels
4. 1608	Field, Nathan	<i>A Woman is a Weathercock</i>	1609-10	Queen's Revels
5. 1608	Fletcher, John	<i>The Faithful Shepherdess</i>	1608-9	Queen's Revels
6. 1608	Fletcher, J; with Beaumont, F.	<i>Cupid's Revenge</i>	c.1607-8	Queen's Revels
7. 1608	Rowley, W & another?)	<i>The Birth of Merlin; or, The Child hath found his father</i>	1597-1621 also dated 1620	Unknown
8. 1609	Beaumont, F, with Fletcher, J.	<i>Philaster; or, Love Lies a Bleeding</i>	May? 1609	Kings'
9. 1609	Fletcher, with Beaumont (rev.by Massinger or Rowley, W?)	<i>The Coxcomb</i>	1608-10	Queen's Revels
10. 1610	Beaumont, F, with Fletcher, J.	<i>The Maid's Tragedy</i>	c.1610-11	Kings'
11. 1610	Robert Daborne	<i>A Christian Turned Turk; or, The Two Famous Pirates Ward and Dansiker</i>	1609-12	Kings', Queen's Revels
12. 1611	Beaumont, F; Fletcher, J.	<i>A King and No King</i>	1611	Kings'
13. 1611	Dekker, T (with Daborne, R?)	<i>If it be not Good, the Devil is in it; If this be not a good play the Devil is in it</i>	1611-12	Queen Anne's
14. 1611	Field, Nathan	<i>Amends for Ladies</i>	c.1610-11	Queen's Revels ?
15. 1611	Fletcher, John	<i>The Night Walker; or, The Little Thief</i>	c.1611	Lady Elizabeth's
16. 1611	Fletcher, John	<i>The Woman's Prize; or, The Tamer Tamed</i>	1611	Unknown Kings' 1633
17. 1611	Middleton, T. Chapman, G?)	<i>The Second Maiden's Tragedy</i>	lic.31 Oct. 1611	Kings'
18. 1611	Anon	<i>Preist the Barber</i>	6-7 Feb(?)	Unknown
19. 1612	Fletcher, J. (with Beaumont, F?)	<i>The Captain</i>	1609-12	King's
20. 1613	Field, N. (with Fletcher, J. and poss. Massinger, P)	<i>The Honest Man's Fortune</i>	1613 relic. 8 Feb. 1624	Lady Elizabeth's Kings
21. 1613	Fletcher, John	<i>Bonduca</i>	1611-14	Kings'
22. 1613	Fletcher, J. with Beaumont, F.	<i>The Scornful Lady</i>	1613-16	Queen's Revels?



23.	1613	Fletcher, J. (with Field?)	<i>Four Plays, or Moral Representations in One</i>	c.1613-19	Unknown
24.	1613	Middleton, T; Rowley, W (Fletcher, J?)	<i>Wit at Several Weapons</i>	c.1609-20	Unknown
25.	1613	Shakespeare, W. (& Fletcher, J?)	<i>Henry VIII; or, All is True</i>	June 1613	King's
26.	1613	Shakespeare, Fletcher (& Beaumont?)	<i>Two Noble Kinsmen</i>	1613-16	King's
27.	1614	Fletcher, John	<i>Valentinian</i>	1610-14	King's
28.	1614	Fletcher, J (revised by another?)	<i>Wit without Money</i>	1614-16 prob.rev.1620	Lady Elizabeth's
29.	1615	Fletcher, John	<i>Monsieur Thomas; or, Father's Own Son</i>	1610-c.1616	Lady Elizabeth's
30.	1616	Fletcher, J. (with Beaumont, F?)	<i>Love's Pilgrimage</i>	1616? rev. 1635	Unknown
31.	1616	Middleton, T, (poss with Fletcher, J.	<i>The Nice Valour; or The Passionate Madman</i>	c.1615-16	Unknown
32.	1617	Fletcher, John	<i>The Chances</i>	c.1617	King's
33.	1617	Fletcher, John	<i>The Mad Lover</i>	acted 5 Jan.1617	King's
34.	1617	Fletcher, J., Massinger, P, rev. by Massinger	<i>The Bloody Brother; or, Rollo Duke of Normandy</i>	1617, 1627-30	King's
35.	1617	Fletcher (& Massinger? Field?)	<i>The Queen of Corinth</i>	1616-c.1618	King's
36.	1616	Fletcher; Massinger	<i>Thierry and Theodoret</i>	1613-1621	King's
37.	1617	Robert Daborne	<i>The Poor Man's Comfort</i>	1615-17	Queen Anne's
38.	1618	Fletcher, John	<i>The Loyal Subject</i>	lic.16 Nov. 1618 rev. 1633	King's
39.	1618	Fletcher; Field; Massinger	<i>The Knight of Malta</i>	1616-1619	King's
40.	1618	Middleton, T.	<i>Hengist, King of Kent; or, The Mayor of Queenborough</i>	1615-1620?	Unknown
41.	1618	Anon	<i>Swetnam the Woman Hater Arraigned by Women</i>	1617-19	King's 1641 Queen Anne's
42.	1619	Field, N, Massinger, P.	<i>The Fatal Dowry</i>	1617-19	King's
43.	1619	Fletcher, John	<i>The Humorous Lieutenant</i>	1619(?)-1625	King's
44.	1619	Fletcher, J; Massinger, P	<i>The Little French Lawyer</i>	1619-23	King's
45.	1619	Fletcher, J; Massinger, P.	<i>Sir John van Olden Barnavelt</i>	Aug. 1619	King's
46.	1619	Anon	<i>Nero</i>	pre. 1619	Unknown
47.	1620	Fletcher, John	<i>Women Pleased</i>	1619-23	King's
48.	1620	Fletcher, J, Massinger, P.	<i>The Custom of the Country</i>	1619-20	King's
49.	1620	Fletcher, J; Massinger, P.	<i>The Double Marriage</i>	1619-23	King's
50.	1620	Fletcher, J; Massinger, P.	<i>The False One</i>	1619-23	King's
51.	1620	Dekker, T., Massinger, P.	<i>The Virgin Martyr</i>	lic.6 Oct. 1620	Red Bull (Revels)
52.	1620	Anon	<i>The Costly Whore</i>	c.1619-1632	Red Bull (Revels)? King's Revels?



53.	1621	Fletcher, John	<i>The Island Princess</i>	1619-21	King's
54.	1621	Fletcher, John	<i>The Pilgrim</i>	1621(?)	King's
55.	1621	Fletcher, John	<i>The Wild Goose Chase</i>	1621 (?)	King's
56.	1621	Anon (Francis Beaumont? Daborne? Massinger? Field?)	<i>The Faithful Friends</i>	1620-28	Unknown
57.	1622	Fletcher, J. (with Massinger, P?)	<i>Beggars' Bush</i>	c.1615-22	King's
58.	1622	Anon	<i>The Two Noble Ladies and the Converted Conjuror</i>	1619-23	Red Bull (Revels)
59.	1624	Webster, J (& Heywood T?)	<i>Appius and Virginia</i>	cx.1608-34(?)	Unknown Beeston's Boys 1639
60.	1634	Massinger, Philip reviser	<i>A Very Woman, or The Prince of Tarent</i> (Poss. reworking of Fletcher and Massinger play of c.1619-1622)	lic.6 June	King's

## APPENDIX THREE

Plays investigated but rejected



### APPENDIX THREE: Plays investigated but rejected

Of the original list of plays for consideration discussed in Chapter Two, I reserved for detailed examination two groups: those already associated with Field, and those of unknown or disputed authorship, belonging to the relevant companies, or whose provenance was unknown, and which fell within the appropriate time-span. Those in the first group, with the addition of *The Faithful Friends*, were the subject of Part Two. This appendix deals with the remainder: the plays on my original list which, as a result of my investigations, I find not to contain work by Field: *Charlemagne; or The Distracted Emperor*, *The Birth of Merlin*, *The Coxcomb* and *Beggar's Bush*. I have also included here one play about which I am still undecided, *The Bloody Brother; or, Rollo, Duke of Normandy*.

#### 1. CHARLEMAGNE; OR, THE DISTRACTED EMPEROR

The play we know as *Charlemagne; or, The Distracted Emperor* is to be found, untitled, in British Museum MS Egerton 1994 (*Eliz. Stage*, I, IV, p.5).<sup>1</sup> We know nothing of its date or provenance. The paper dates possibly from 1605-1632: the handwriting has a similar time-span. The Malone Society editor suggests 'a good many years either side of 1600, though perhaps rather later than earlier'.<sup>2</sup> Internal allusions make a date around 1604 plausible, but there is no sound evidence (*Charlemagne*, p.viii). This early date renders Field's authorship virtually impossible.

The manuscript is thought to be 'a fair copy made by the author himself' (*Charlemagne*, p.vi). This main hand is not Field's, as a

comparison between his autograph letters and the manuscript makes clear.<sup>3</sup> There seems no external evidence to connect Field with the play at all. This is amply confirmed by the paucity of the internal evidence.

#### (i) *Linguistic*

The linguistic profile of the *Charlemagne* playwright differs from Field's. There is no use of *ye* alongside *you*, *a* is frequently used for *he*, and there are no forms in *-ee*. Contractions are used sparingly. The regular use of *hathe*, with *doth* and the use of *whylst* are the only features similar to Field's linguistic pattern, and examples are few.

#### (ii) *Prosodic*

The scarcity of rhyme, even at act and scene end argues against Field's authorship. There is very little of his vigorous prose. The blank verse is not sufficiently distinctive to suggest any attribution.

#### (iii) *Textual and Accidental*

Apart from spellings like *ranckell*, *chyncke* and *wrinckles* none of the accidentals in the text are like Field's (*Charlemagne*, 1676, 1313, 1258).



(iv) *Theatrical*

There is only one instance of a prepared entry and characters do not use names or swift explanatory asides. The stage directions are brief.

(v) *Literary*

A potentially promising parallel in Act III, 'tys daungerous iesting with edge toole' (*Charlemagne*, 1425), which can be directly compared with *The Honest Man's Fortune* (p.156, II.2.230) and *Amends for Ladies* (I.1.294), must be dismissed as merely proverbial.<sup>4</sup> Of the oaths and expletives in the play there are no occurrences of Field's *pish* or *humh* and the three instances of *sfoote* (479, 1420 and 2111) and the one *byslight* (2284) are not sufficiently frequent to be indicative. Apart from one minor figure in Act I, the imagery shows no sign of Field's favourite comparisons.

In these circumstances, I can say with fair confidence that Field did not write or contribute to *Charlemagne; or, The Distracted Emperor*. He is not the 'amateur, influenced possibly by the work of Chapman' to whom the Malone Society editor attributes the play (*Charlemagne*, p.xi)

## 2. THE BIRTH OF MERLIN; OR, THE CHILD HATH FOUND HIS FATHER

*The Birth of Merlin; or, The Child hath Found his Father* was first published by Francis Kirkham in 1662 (*Eliz. Stage*, III, 474-5).<sup>5</sup> Its title page claims the play for William Rowley and Shakespeare but this has not met with scholarly assent. Instead it has been variously assigned - to Middleton,

with or without Rowley, to Beaumont, to Fletcher, or to both. There is no reason to suspect Field's involvement apart from its putative date. Tucker Brooke places the play sometimes during the reign of James I. We know nothing of the play's provenance. The external evidence does nothing to imply Field's involvement in the play. The internal evidence is no more convincing.

(i) *Linguistic*

Linguistically, there is a scattering of recognisably Fieldian forms but there are no instances of forms in *-ee* and no scene has any particular concentration of preferred forms. There are, for example, two occurrences of *hath* in I.2, and one in III.2 but these are not coincident with *doth* in II.1 or IV.5. There are occasional contracted forms, *ath* in II.1 and *ith* in II.1 and III.1, for example, but these are insufficient to alert one to Field. There is a very sparing use of *ye* in II.2, II.3 and IV.1, but the absence of *ye* alongside *you* throughout argues against Field. *Em*, a favoured form, is very rare. *Th'art* in II.3 and IV.1 and *th'ast* in III.2 are the only other possible Fieldian indicators.

(ii) *Prosodic*

The prosodic tests are also negative. There is no rhyme beyond the conventional scene end rhymes and the rhyme used for spells, except for one end of speech rhyme in III.4. It is difficult to know about verse and prose since the quarto prints all as prose apart from the couplets.



### (iii) *Textual and Accidental*

The accidentals and textual features of the play *are* reminiscent of Field's work with the spellings *linck* and *monckey* in I.2 and III.4, three uses of *Omnes* in II.2, III.2 and III.6, and in a Latin direction *Exeunt manet Prince* in II.3.

### (iv) *Theatrical*

Theatrically *The Birth of Merlin* is unlike Field's work. Its subject-matter - the concern with the supernatural and its handling - are not in Field's style. Characters are not named on entry. Explanatory asides are missing. Field would not ask for anything as complicated as 'a stone falls and kills Proximus', the appearance of a blazing star (IV.4), or thunder and lightning in the rock (V.1), nor does he write scenes involving fighting Dragons.

### (v) *Literary*

There are a few pointers in the oaths and expletives to Field: *sfoot* in I.1 and II.1, *slid* in III.1 and III.4, and *Pish* in I.2 and IV.1. *Hum, hum, hum* appears five times in IV.5. Yet these forms are not accompanied by any of Field's customary imagery or habits of speech.

As a result of applying my tests to *The Birth of Merlin* I am reasonably certain that Field was not involved as part author.

### 3. THE COXCOMB

*The Coxcomb* was first published in the Beaumont and Fletcher folio of 1647, but it must have been written before 2 or 3 November 1612 when it was performed by the Children of the Queen's Revels at Court (*Eliz. Stage*, III, 223).<sup>6</sup> A possible source, *The Curious Impertinent*, appeared in a French translation in 1608 but was not published in English until 1612. This story may have supplied part of the plot for Field's *Amends for Ladies*.<sup>7</sup> An allusion to *The Coxcomb* in Jonson's *The Alchemist* of 1610 may suggest a date before this.<sup>8</sup> Its actor list shows that *The Coxcomb* was also performed by the Lady Elizabeth's company in or around 1613.<sup>9</sup> It later came into the possession of the King's Men, who performed it at Court in 1622 and 1636 (*Eliz. Stage*, III, 223). *The Coxcomb* is thus one of the group of plays whose movements shadow Field's.<sup>10</sup> Though circumstantial evidence and the possible date of the play would allow Field's part authorship there is nothing in its composition to suggest his involvement as a writer. My tests indicate nothing to prevent an acceptance of Hoy's attribution to Beaumont and Fletcher (Hoy, III, 90). The 'copy furnished to the printer was the prompt book, or, more likely, a transcript of it' (Cauthen, p.264), so the folio text does not necessarily preserve original authorial forms. Nonetheless, were parts of the play Field's more of his distinctive characteristics would have shown up through the screen of scribal and compositorial interference.

#### (i) Linguistic

Very little indicates Field's participation. There are no occurrences of his characteristic *d'ee* or *t'ee* forms, though the unusual *goodbwy* in Act V (p.114) is interesting. *Th'art* appears twice, both times in scenes where they are not associated with other Fielding<sup>ian</sup> features. His preferred *thou'rt* is rare



(I.5, p.100, V.2, p.114). *Whilst* occurs in Act V (p.115). The linguistic patterns that emerge from the play are not consistently Field's

### (ii) *Prosodic*

An indication that Field did not collaborate on this play is the almost entire absence of rhyme. Apart from the play's final rhyme and a weak scene ending rhyme in I.4 (p.99), the only other rhyme occurs in V.2 (p.114) where Viola clinches her attack on Richardo with a mid scene rhyme. Though the extensive use of prose might suggest Field's authorship of some scenes, the prose is quite distinct: it does not modulate into verse and back, and there is none of that mixture of prose and verse that typifies Field. The blank verse is regular - nothing indicates whether it could be Field's or not.

### (iii) *Textual and Accidental*

That none of *The Coxcomb* should be given to Field is indicated by the absence of any of his distinctive textual or accidental features. Apart from one flurry of spellings of *Tinck/Tincker* in II.2 (p.102) where we have five speech headings and one occurrence in the text, the unusual *Milckmaides* in a stage direction and *twinkling* in the text of Act IV (p.109), there are none of his favoured spellings. Brackets, scarcely used at all, are conventional. There is a sprinkling of misplaced apostrophes but they do not form any significant pattern. There is only one Latin stage direction (p.95) and only one speech headed *All* (p.100).

#### (iv) *Theatrical*

Stage directions in *The Coxcomb* are conventional. They show little explanatory detail of voice, costume or movement. The fullest are *Enter a Servingman aboue unready* (II.1, p.101), *Enter Wife as out of her head* (II.1, p.101) and *Enter Mother beating Viola, Alexander, with a broken glass* (IV.7, p.111). No directions indicate groupings or stage pictures. Exits and entrances are not handled distinctively and characters are not named on entry. The pattern of scenic construction is unlike Field's. Each act consists of a large number of short scenes in which the mode is frequently duologue. There are few asides, and there are none, so characteristic of Field's work, where the spectators are briefly and swiftly taken into a character's confidence. The only exception may be the Wife's recognition of the ring in II.3 (p.104). The play contains very few opportunities for large-scale theatrical effect; no pageantry, music, or dumbshow, though there is dancing in Act I. Not surprisingly, *The Coxcomb* shares with Field's play some stock dramatic conventions - a tavern scene and a disguised husband, for example - but their handling is not reminiscent of Field's.

#### (v) *Literary*

The diction of *The Coxcomb* does not include Field's favourite words, nor have I detected any of his preferred imagery. Proverbial expressions and *sententiae*, common with Field, are absent here. Initially promising are the *uds'* forms of oaths. In I.2 (p.98) and IV.8 (p.111) we have *Udsfoote*, in I.5



(p.99) and II.2 (p.108) *vds pretious* and in III.3 (p.108) *Vds me*. Unfortunately there is virtually no correlation between these forms and other Fieldian characteristics. The occurrences of *hum* in I.2 (p.98) and V.3 (p.115) are too infrequent to be useful. There are no extended passages of bawdy or sexual innuendo.

Because of the nature of the copy which lies behind the folio text of *The Coxcomb* Hoy makes his allocations as much on the basis of metrical and plot criteria as he does on linguistic ones. Nonetheless, he has no doubt that the play is 'in its original form, at least, a Beaumont-Fletcher collaboration' (Hoy, III.90). I am equally convinced that Field wrote no part of it.

#### 4. BEGGARS' BUSH

*Beggars' Bush* exists in several texts. The most authoritative is in Beaumont and Fletcher, *F.1647*, and there is also another version: a scribal copy in the hand of the *Aglaure* scribe, probably Edward Knight, preserved in the Lambarde manuscript.<sup>11</sup> We do not know the date of composition: assignments to the range 1613-1622 are based partly on the assumption that Beaumont was involved. The *terminus ad quem* is 27 December 1622 when the play, popular at court, was performed at Whitehall. It seems to have been a King's Men's play (Bowers, III, 227). Whilst the date range does not rule out Field as a part author there is nothing in the play's external evidence to connect him with it.

The copy for the folio text may have been Massinger's fair copy of the

play as Bowers originally surmised, the same manuscript from which the prompt book was prepared, and which was also copied to make the Lambarde MS.<sup>12</sup> It is thus not very dependable as a basis for the investigation of linguistic forms or accidentals. Hoy uses both folio and manuscript as the bases of his linguistic study on the grounds that they are 'sufficiently of a piece' (Hoy, III, p.87). Folio and manuscript differ substantially in some places (Bowers, III, 230-36).

It is not certain how many authors were involved in *Beggars' Bush*. The shares of Fletcher and Massinger can be readily assigned in Acts I, III and IV but Acts II and V have not met with consensus. Hoy gives Act II and part of Act V to Beaumont but Dorenkamp finds no third author present since Hoy's identification of a third linguistic pattern is 'unwarranted' (Hoy, III, 87-89, Dorenkamp, p.36). If one accepts Dorenkamp's proposal - Act I, II and V to Massinger and Act III and IV to Fletcher - and it does have the merit of simplicity - then Field has to be disregarded. The authorial shares of Fletcher and Massinger in the non-disputed scenes are clear enough, and there are sufficient indications in the text to make his attribution of the disputed sections to Massinger a working hypothesis. However, this simplicity is misleading.

There is certainly a third hand present in the play to judge by the spelling variants adduced by Bowers. In the spelling of the proper names Act V establishes variants from the rest of the play in ways which 'seem established in the original copy both for F and for MS' (Bowers, III, p.240). But this does not confirm Hoy's linguistic hypothesis since there is no direct correlation with his findings. His 'third linguistic pattern' links Act V with Act II: the orthography of names separates them. Neither does it assist Dorenkamp's argument for two authors since the spelling variants do not align directly with his attributions. Bowers attempts to rationalize the



situation by postulating fair copy for either Act II or Act V. He justifies this because

Dr Hoy remains firm in his conviction that Beaumont wrote Acts II and V, and the present editor is inclined to accept his peculiar expertise in this matter.

(Bowers, III, p.241)

Hoy's linguistic evidence is sparse but the linguistic profile he identifies as Beaumont's could just as well be Field's. There are just not enough forms to make any distinction conclusive (Hoy, III, 88). Act II could be Field's with its concurrence of *hath* and *doth*, its use of contracted forms *i'th(e)* and *o'th(e)*, *em*, *twixt* and *'s* for *his*. Act V.2 could also be his with *i'the*, *ha'*, *othe*, *ye*, *em*, *whilst* and the curious *th'hast*.

#### (ii) *Textual and Accidental*

The accidentals of the text are equally inconclusive. We could give Field the intrusive 'c' spellings of II.3 with *Van-dunck*, *Van-doncke* and *Van duncke*, and link these with *sinck*, *sincking* and *Van-doncks* in V.2. These are not, however, significant since spellings with *-ck* or *-nck* are indifferently distributed through the text: *ircksome* (I.2), *ranck*, *shrunck* (III.1), *shrinck*, *stincking* (III.2), *sunck* in III.5 are examples.

Brackets are frequent but indifferently used throughout the play. There is a single *Omnes* in II.2 but *All* also occurs in III.1 and III.4. One can learn little from these features about the play's authorship.

### (iii) *Prosodic*

Prosodically Acts II and V do not seem to be by Field. Rhyme is markedly absent even at the end of scenes in most of Act II. V.1 has no end scene rhyme. In V.2, however, one speech ends in a rhyme, and the play ends, conventionally enough, on a rhyme. Prose, frequently used by Field, is not present in these scenes, though the class of characters and their situation might lead one to expect prose.

### (iv) *Theatrical*

The extant stage directions show no sign of Field's usual concerns with grouping or small business. Apart from 'O here a Judge comes' (II.1.45) there are none of the carefully prepared entrances one expects from Field's work. There is very little naming of characters, and virtually no recapitulation of the story. Direct address and solo speech are rare. An aside (II.1.41) is not distinctive, and it is the only one in the disputed scenes. A song in II.1 might be Field's but there are other songs in shares that cannot be attributed to him.

### (v) *Literary*

The imagery of the play is unlike Field's. His etymological vocabulary and favoured words find no match here. Of Field's favourite oaths and expletives there are only *slight* in V.2 and *slid* in Act II, far too insignificant to base a case on.

Though I find it impossible to determine whether or not Dorenkamp is correct in sharing the play between Fletcher and Massinger alone, and cannot



say whether Beaumont, too, should be considered, I am reasonably confident that *Beggars' Bush* contains no work by Field.

##### 5. ROLLO, DUKE OF NORMANDY; OR, THE BLOODY BROTHER

The mysterious paradoxes presented by the play known variously as *The Bloody Brother* and as *Rollo, Duke of Normandy* begin with the documentary evidence. The Stationers' Register entry of 4 October 1639 records 'A Tragedy called The Bloody Brother by I.B.' The resulting quarto appeared in London the same year, with a change of publisher and attribution. Its title page reads 'THE BLOODY/BROTHER/A Tragedy./By B.J.F...'. No company is mentioned. In 1640 in Oxford the same play appeared in quarto with a different title and publisher. The title page of 'The Tragoedy of/ROLLO/DUKE Of Normandy' asserts that it was written by 'JOHN FLETCHER/Gent' and acted by 'HIS/Majesties Servants'.<sup>13</sup> This second quarto's claim to be a King's Men's play receives confirmation from the regular court performances of *Rollo* by that company during the 1630s (*Jac. and Car. Stage*, III, 401-7). Q1 cannot be assigned to a company so confidently.

The discrepancies between the attributions and the interpretation of 'I.B.' and of 'B.J.F.' have given rise to scholarly speculation but their exact meaning remains a mystery. Varying combinations of Beaumont, Jonson and Fletcher have been proposed but with no consensus.<sup>14</sup>

Equally mysterious is the play's stage history. It may have originated with the Lady Elizabeth's combined company, and been taken, along with *Bussy D'Ambois*, *The Coxcomb* and *The Honest Man's Fortune*, and other

plays, to the King's Men by Nathan Field. John Freehafer suggests that the publication of the second quarto in Oxford was the result of a dispute between the two companies which began with the re-formed Lady Elizabeth's company trying to reassert their claims to *Bussy D'Ambois* (Freehafer, p.66). Circumstantial evidence, then, associates Field with *The Bloody Brother* both as manager and leading actor of its original company, and as agent of its transfer to the King's repertory. Field's involvement is not, in any case, dependent on Freehafer's hypothesis. He was a regular collaborator with John Fletcher on plays for both companies in the period 1613-20.

The play's date of composition is not known. Its *terminus ad quem* must, presumably, be 1625, the date of Fletcher's death. Its putative sources offer little help since they are all standard texts generally available in the early 1600s.<sup>15</sup> Parallels between *The Bloody Brother* and *Neptune's Triumph* would determine a date post 1624, the date of the latter's publication, if it were certain that *Neptune's Triumph* were the original, but the borrowing could have been in the other direction.<sup>16</sup> The Fiske Norbret scenes owe as much to *The Alchemist* of 1610.<sup>17</sup> On the basis of contemporary allusions Bertha Hensman argues for 1617 but contradicts this by proposing source material not available until 1619. She seems on weak ground when she suggests that

the burlesque challenges and abortive duels of Act 1 indicate a date of composition after James I's Star Chamber Speech against Duelling of February 1616/17, for before 1616, stage duels were treated as matters of honour,

(Hensman, *Shares*, p.263)

since interrupted duels are common enough in plays written before 1617 and those in *The Bloody Brother* are not abortive or burlesque. I can detect no sign of the caricature of Lord Hay that Hensman refers to, nor of the



'invidious set piece of anti-French sentiment' (Hensman, *Shares*, p.264). She may be right in supposing that a reference to a sword 'having made when it was Charlemaines/Three thousand knights' (*Bloody Brother*, I.1.89-96) is 'an allusion to James I's indiscriminate creation of a very large number of knights on a royal progress to Edinburgh in June 1617' but there need be no special reference here. Contemporary satire on James's creation of knights was a perennial favourite with dramatists throughout his reign (Hensman, *Shares*, p.263). The names of the astrologers in IV.2, Norbret, La Fiske and De Bube, may be derived from notorious figures in contemporary London. Nicholas Fisk was implicated in the murder of Sir Thomas Overbury, most topical in late 1615-16. Bretnor, a writer of almanacs, is associated with him in Jonson's *Devil is an Ass*, written and performed in 1616. A Captain Bubb was pilloried in 1616 for malpractices (Hensman, *Shares*, p.267). A date post 1616 would answer to topicality but the names do not rule out an earlier date since all were well known in London in the early 1600s. The fourth member of the group is, according to Hensman, 'clearly a stage representation of the mediaeval necromancer, Friar Rush' but it is difficult to see how this character's name helps with dating (Hensman, *Shares*, p.267).<sup>18</sup>

Two points against a date as early as 1617 have been raised by John Jump and by Hensman herself. Jump argues for a later date on the grounds of Fletcher's style (Jump, p.xxx). Since, however, the parallels he cites in support of Fletcher's authorship include passages from Fletcher's writing well before 1620, I view the stylistic arguments with scepticism. Hensman's proposal that the play's treatment of Rollo, Duke of Normandy as a tyrant is unusual, and that this is due to Dumesny's *Gesta Normanorum in Franciae Ante Rollorem Ducem*, which did not become available until 1619, fails to convince (Hensman, 'Fletcher's *The Bloody Brother*', pp.133-37). Characterisation of 'the bloody brother' as tyrannous is demanded by incidents in the story in the Roman history from which the plot is taken.



The settings and names of the characters may be French but there is no presumption that the authors were intending historical accuracy, in their mixture of chronicles. The balance, then, is in favour of a date in or around 1616, but the evidence is far from satisfactory. It allows of Field's part authorship.

I next consider the nature of the copy for the variant quartos. The texts of Q1 and Q2 are obviously closely related but there are sufficient substantive differences to confirm, as Jump, Hoy and Hensman have stated, that each quarto derives from an independent manuscript.<sup>19</sup> In some details Q2 is more literary than Q1.<sup>20</sup> In Act 1 only, Q2 organises its stage directions and scene divisions on the continental model. Q2 regularises certain stage directions, employing consistently the Latin form *Exeunt omnes praeter...* where Q1 varies from act to act.<sup>21</sup> Q2 prints the words of the song in Act II where Q1 has only *They sing*.<sup>22</sup> Q2's stage directions are sometimes more explicit and detailed than Q1's.<sup>23</sup> In Q2 'A stoole set out' and 'florish' may indicate prompt copy (Q2, D3r, p.27; Q2, K2r, p.73). Neither is present in Q1. Both Q1 and Q2 give directions for 'a banquet set out' in Act V and *Hoboyes and a banquet* in Act II. These directions may be a book-keeper's or may be authorial. A marginal note in Q2's Act V.2 may be a prompter's addition: *Sophia, Matilda, Aubrey and Lords at the doore*, is followed some four lines later by *Enter Soph. Matil. Aub. Lords and Attendants*. But the note could as easily be editorial, or, perhaps even authorial, necessarily clarifying Q1's simple *Within* for the reader. Both Q1 and Q2 supply directions for hand properties such as Rollo's glass and Hamond's letters (Q1, H2r, H2v; Q2 H4r, p.61; H4v, p.62). These are as likely to be authorial as prompt copy. Q1 supplies a necessary entrance for Edith in Act II and prints as prose lines printed in Q2 as verse (Q1, D4r, Q2, Dr, p.23; Q1, G2v, G3, Q2 F3v, F4r, pp.44-5). To accommodate these characteristics of Q1 and Q2 I have made two



decisions. I shall adopt as a working hypothesis the idea that Q2 had as its copy text a partially edited version of a prompt book. This was either an annotated fair copy of authorial foul papers, or was the annotated foul papers themselves. There has been intervention in the presentation of the text for publication. This account of Q2 obtains whether Freehafer's hypothesis about the play's history is correct or not. Q2's copy must have been supplied by the King's Men. It seems unlikely that they would have released the text for Q2 to another publisher so soon after the first, if they had already supplied the text for Q1. Since Q1 and Q2 are substantively different, and since I think Q2 to be a prompt book, then Q1 is likely to be either a scribal transcript of either authorial foul papers or a fair copy of those foul papers. If Freehafer is right about the movement of the play from Lady Elizabeth's to King's, and if Field took with him the Lady Elizabeth's prompt book, then William Beeston would have to supply his publisher with a transcript of foul papers for Q1. Alternatively, if Field took foul papers with him to King's, who then had their own prompt book made up, then Q1 could be based on the Lady Elizabeth's prompt book. In either case, and regardless of whether Freehafer is right or wrong, neither text provides a very dependable basis for determining authorial forms.

I am interested in the authorship problems of *The Bloody Brother* only in so far as they affect Field's canon. I have therefore limited<sup>ed</sup> my investigation of the play to those sections not already confidently assigned by scholars to Fletcher and Massinger. There is considerable agreement about this. All agree that Fletcher, whose authorship is suggested by Q2's title page, and seventeenth century allusions, wrote the whole of Act II, a small section of Act III and most of Act V. They give to Massinger Act I and the non-Fletcherian parts of Act V. This leaves most of Act III and the whole of Act IV unaccounted for.<sup>24</sup> Rival contenders for the disputed scenes are

Chapman, first put forward by Wells, and Jonson proposed by Garnett and by Crawford.<sup>25</sup> Boyle, Macaulay and Chelli suggest Field but this is denied by Sykes and Brinkley.<sup>26</sup> I have applied my tests to the disputed scenes in Acts III and IV to see whether it is possible to attribute them to Field. The results were disappointingly inconclusive and I have had, reluctantly, to leave this unsatisfactory situation unresolved.

(i) *Linguistic*

Unfortunately there are only a few linguistic forms which will distinguish Field's work from Chapman's. Chapman prefers *while* to Field's *whilst*, but both prefer *betwixt* to *between*. Both use *em* and *them*, but Chapman rarely uses *em* in tragedies. *Ha'*, a form popular with Field, does not occur in Chapman's tragedies.<sup>27</sup> *Ye* and *you* are indifferently used by both. Like Field, Chapman's use of *a* for *he* is rare. Forms with *ws* (for *his*) are not frequent. Again, as with Field's work, there is a high incidence of *hath* and *doth* in Chapman's tragedies. Chapman is very likely to use *t'* before a verb starting with a vowel; Field does so rarely. A useful Chapman marker is *an't*.

The most distinctive feature of Jonson's linguistic pattern is the very unusual *yo'* alongside the occasional appearance of *ye* and *y'*. Field is more likely than Jonson to use *ye*. Jonson consistently uses *'hem* instead of Field's *them* and *em* used indifferently. *W'* for *with* is a favoured Jonsonian contraction, but *t'* is not a regular feature of his work, nor are forms in *-ee*. Jonson prefers *between* to *betwixt* and *while* to *whil(e)st* but the alternative forms do occur occasionally.

Like both Chapman and Field, Jonson uses *hath* and *doth* frequently, but *has* is more common than *hath*. While Field writes *thou'rt* both



Jonson and Chapman write *th'art*.

Field's -'ee and *thou'rt*, Chapman's *t'* and *an't*, Jonson's *yo'* and *hem* are all eccentric usages but may not appear with sufficient frequency to be useful.

In Act III.1 several of the play's linguistic indicators suggest Field rather than Chapman. Field regularly uses *i'th*, found once in both Q1 and Q2 and also, with a misplaced apostrophe in Q2 (Q1, E3v; Q2, E1, p.31).<sup>28</sup> Chapman uses *ith* only very occasionally. In this context, Field is more likely than Chapman to use *'em* or *'m* and the abbreviated forms *'twixt* and *gainst*. The latter appears as *against* in Q1 (Q1, E4, [F]3r, E2r, E3r; Q2, Er, p.31, E4r, p.37, D3, p.27, D4, p.29). The *t'* elision, typical of Chapman, also occurs in III.1 but where Q1 has *t'encounter* and *to excuse*, Q2 has *to encounter* and *t'excuse* (Q1, E3r, F1v; Q2, D4r, p.29, E2v, p.34). *Hath* is not a useful discriminator since both Field and Chapman use it: its presence in III.1 could indicate either. *T'ye* on Q2 F1v, a slightly unusual form, is reminiscent of Field's *The Fatal Dowry* (II.2.118). The *ye* forms in Q2 are indifferent: both Field and Chapman use them.

There are no useful linguistic discriminators in either text of IV.3, the other scene which has been attributed to Chapman. Hoy points out the three uses of *t'* (*t'employ* x 2 and *t'hast*) which suggest it is Chapman's but the single *hath* in Q1 could be due to either Field or Chapman (Q2, H3, p.59, H3v, p.60, Q1, H1r, H1v). Since Hoy is 'personally persuaded that [Wells] has established Chapman's presence in the play' he discusses the 'pitifully slight' linguistic evidence in these terms. He is forced, however, to defend his attribution of III.1.a and III.1.c and IV.3 to Chapman on literary, not linguistic, grounds (Hoy, VI, p.63). On so little evidence it is certainly not possible to affirm or deny either Chapman's or Field's presence on linguistic forms alone.

The evidence presented by IV.1 is also slight but I agree with Hoy, with some reservations, that it could be attributed to Jonson. It is not, I think, by Field. Yet the only distinctively Jonsonian form is *yo* found, in the Q2 text only, at the end of the scene (Q2, [G]2v, p.50). The scenes five occurrences of *hath* and *doth* cannot discriminate between Jonson and Field, and neither can the frequent use of *I'me*. Jonson favours forms with *w'* so *w'yee* could be Field's or Jonson's (Q1, g1v). The contraction of *them* used in this scene is consistently *'em* rather than Jonson's *hem*, but *while* is more likely to be Jonson's than Field's. IV.2 offers very few forms that allow discrimination between Field and Jonson. A group of occurrences of *yee* at the opening of Q2's version may indicate Field and both texts have a fairly frequent use of *em*, *i'th* and *o'th*. *Ha'* (for *have*) and *on's* are not useful (Q2, H1r, p.55, H2r, p.57; G3r, p.51).

The linguistic evidence, such as it is, illustrates the difficulty of assigning authorship when linguistic patterns of individual authors are not sharply divergent. It leaves the question of the authorship of the disputed scenes unresolved.

## (ii) *Prosodic*

The use of rhyme in the disputed scenes, with the single exception of IV.2 is similar to that in Field's work. In the opening sequence in III.1 of *The Bloody Brother* the strength of the argument between Sophia and Otto is reflected in its rhymes as each tries to counter the other's points with carefully placed rhyming couplets. Matilda's plea to Sophia is neatly framed by rhymes. Act III is divided into units by its rhymes. Rollo exits after Otto's murder on a rhyme. His return is similarly signalled. Aubrey's



intervention to prevent Rollo's killing his sister is prefaced by a brief rhymed sequence. The Citizen episode concludes in rhyme, and a rhymed exchange between Rollo and Aubrey takes everyone except Edith and Latorch off stage.

The rhymes of IV.3 also occur in sequences, as points in the debate between Matilda, Edith and Sophia culminate in Sophia's exit on a rhyme. The progress of Edith's persuasion and Matilda's agreement are marked by couplets (*Bloody Brother*, IV.3.54).

While the use of rhyme seems to support the notion that Field rather than Chapman is responsible for the disputed scenes, except for IV.2, a case can be made against it by the scarcity of prose. Differences between the lineation of the two quartos, as for example in IV.1, make it difficult to determine whether prose passages in Q1 are the result of the compositor trying to save space - as they might well be - or whether they represent Field's tendency to move in and out of prose and blank verse within a few lines (Q1, G2v, G3; Q2, F3v, F4r, pp.44-5). The fact that the encounter with the cheating astrologers in IV.2 is written in verse makes me think that it is not Field's. He would surely have written this potentially comic scene in prose. The verse here is more tightly structured than Field's and there is no rhyme.

### (iii) *Textual and Accidental*

These tests are more than usually unreliable in this context because of the intervention of scribes and compositors in the transmission of texts of Q1 and Q2, but there remains the possibility of some authorial survivals. Analysis of Q2's use of parentheses to mark vocatives, for example, yields a significant pattern of distribution which coincides with divisions resulting from other texts. They are heaviest in the scenes with the most rhyme, for example. None occur in those scenes attributed to Fletcher alone.

Bracketted vocatives are common with Field.

The disputed scenes show some signs of the way in which Field uses brackets. The improvised quality of Rollo's speech to the citizens is achieved in a similar way to a passage in *A Woman is a Weathercock* (II.1.7-13), as an important plot element is placed in brackets (III.1, Q1, F4r; Q2, F1r, p.39). In IV.1 Latorch is equally clumsy (Q1, g1r; Q2, G2r, p.49). Brackets are used for phrasing speeches and for showing shifts in dramatic focus (Q2, D3v, p.28, D4r, p.29; E1v, p.32, F4v, p.46, G1r, p.47). Similar examples can be found in IV.2 (Q2, G4r, p.53, H1r, p.55).

Because of the uncertainties regarding the copy, the placing of apostrophes may not be regarded as significant, but Q2's *'ith* (E1r, p.31) and Q1's *does't* (G3) could be survivals of Field's practice, like the spellings *blanck* (Q2, G2r, p.49) and *plancks* (Q1 *planckes* [G]1v, Q2, G3v, p.52). There is one Latin stage direction in III.1, appearing as *Exit omnes, Praeter, Latorch, and Edith* in Q1 (F4) and as *Exeunt omnes praeter Latorch & Edith* in Q2 (F1r, p.39). There is no further use of Latin in these scenes in Q1. Q2 has *Exeunt omnes praeter Rollo & Latorch* in IV.1 (G1v, p.48), but this appears as *Exeunt all but Rollo & Lator.* in Q1 (G4v). In Field's work *manent* is usually used instead of the formula with *praeter*.

The textual and accidental features of the text are not entirely dismissive of Field's presence in *The Bloody Brother* but neither do they support it strongly.

#### (iv) *Theatrical*

The stage directions are not like Field's in either text. Hammond is



instructed to enter '*with a head*' and Rollo has to enter '*arm'd*' but otherwise there are no directions calling for more than a simple exit or entrance (Q1, E3r; Q2, D4r, p.29; F2v, Q2, E4v, p.38). Pippeau is told to '*Exit and enter again To Norbret*' (Q1, C2) and other marginal notes direct the actions (Q1, E4r; Q2, E1r, p.31; Q2, E2r, p.33). Prepared and covered entrances are rare and only a few characters are named on entry. Structurally III.1 with its rushed sequence of duologues is not like Field's work, which relies much more on ensemble. The sparseness of asides and solo speech also works against the likelihood of Field's authorship. I would be surprised if any of the disputed scenes were Field's in view of their dramaturgical differences from his usual work.

(v) *Literary*

The imagery of III.1 of *The Bloody Brother* is, on the other hand, really rather like Field's.<sup>29</sup> Matilda comments on Rollo's behaviour.

Who knowes not the unbounded flood and sea  
In which my brother Rollo's appetites  
Alter and rage with every puffe of breath  
His swelling blood exhales...

(*Bloody Brother*, III.1.56)

In a similar confusion of images, Latorch promises Edith

...when your eares are freer to take in  
Your most amendful and unmatched fortunes  
I'le make yee drowne a hundred helplesse deaths  
In sea of one life pour'd into your bosome  
With which shall flowe into your armes the riches  
The pleasures, honours, and the rule of Princes.

(*Bloody Brother*, III.1.391)

The sea/flood images are among those listed as Field's favourites by Brinkley (p.115). Towards the end of III.1 Rollo refers to 'The Curtian Gulfe of this conspiracy', echoing a passage from *The Fatal Dowry* 'You Curtius-like have throwne into the gulfe...' (*Fatal Dowry*, II.2.331). 'Gulfe' is a word of which Field is fond. He invariably uses it instead of pit or chasm.<sup>30</sup> *The Fatal Dowry* and *The Bloody Brother* also share an allusion to the viper as a symbol of ingratitude (*Fatal Dowry*, II.1.65; *Bloody Brother*, III.1.82). Yet all these parallels can be dismissed as commonplace, part of the usual stock of Jacobean dramatists.

The diction of the disputed scene of *The Bloody Brother* is not unlike Field's, but the evidence is not strong. The archaic transitive use of *object* is shared by Latorch and Gomera of *The Knight of Malta* (*Knight of Malta*, I.3, p.74, *Bloody Brother*, IV.1.30). Field frequently uses verbs as nouns; examples include *suspects*, *reject*, *sleep*, *helps* and *confronts* (Brinkley, p.116). These parallel the 'submissee beseeches' of *The Bloody Brother* (IV.3.2). Yet obviously Field is not unique in this.

In 1928 William Wells listed vocabulary favoured by Chapman and found in scenes in *The Bloody Brother*. But, as with the examples listed above, many of these are too common in the work of other writers of the period, Field among them, to prove decisively whether the scenes are by Chapman or Field, or indeed, neither of them. Of the words Wells selects *fiery* can be found in association with *exhalation* in *A Woman is a Weathercock* (IV.1.68; III.2.210) and in Field's share of *The Fatal Dowry* (III.1.299, III.1.96, III.1.253), while *soothe* is also used by him (*Fatal Dowry*, II.2.353). One parallel drawn by Wells is the phrase 'Author of Prodigies' (*Bloody Brother*, III.1.102) which can also be found in *Bussy D'Ambois* (V.1.150). But a memorable phrase asks to be imitated, and Field was famous for acting Bussy. It is interesting to note that of the parallels cited by Wells almost all come from *Bussy D'Ambois*. Any Chapman echoes in *The Bloody Brother* could as easily be Field's, but it is equally likely that they can be explained by commonplace.



The literary evidence suggests that it is Jonson, not Field, who is the author of IV.1. This receives support from a set of parallels first cited by Charles Crawford.

We now are Duke alone, Latorch, secur'd  
Nothing left standing to obscure our prospect  
We look right forth, beside and round about us,  
And see it ours with pleasure.

(*Bloody Brother*, IV.1.157)

This rise is made yet! and we now stand, ranck'd  
To view about us, all that were above us!  
Nought hinders now our prospect, all are even  
We walke upon a leuell...

(*Mortimer his Fall*, I.1.1-4)

This is Monte potiri, to get the hill  
For no perfect Discovery can bee made upon  
a flat or a leuell...

(*Discoveries*, 2122-4)

The passage from *The Bloody Brother* clearly reflects the two Jonson passages. The parallel is too close, I think, to be accidental. Unless two authors independently used the same source, the passage in *The Bloody Brother* must be by Jonson. *Mortimer his Fall* exists only as an incomplete and unperformed fragment. Though it has 'the air of being early work' it was not published until 1640 when it was printed from a rough draft. Any echoing of *Mortimer his Fall* cannot be reminiscent of performance or from reading a published text. It could be argued that Field might have had access to Jonson's private papers; he was Jonson's scholar and read Latin with him (Brinkley, p.22). But, in view of numerous other Jonsonian parallels offered by Crawford I am inclined to take note of the *yo'* as Jonson's too and to

suggest that IV.1 is Jonson's.<sup>31</sup> I can see very little sign of Field in IV.2 and I think it too is more likely to be Jonson's. Field is certainly capable of Jonsonian imitation and we know that he acted in *The Alchemist*, to which IV.2 seems indebted, but indications of Field's authorship are very few. The energetic bawdy of

Pox, he feeds  
With lechery, and lives upon th'exchange  
Of his two eggs and puddings with the market women...

(*Bloody Brother*, IV.2.13)

employs Field's favourite 'pudding' in<sup>u</sup>endo, and the character of Pippeau is in the same tradition as the Page in *A Woman is a Weathercock*, but IV.2 is in verse, where Field prefers prose for low-life scenes.

I find it hard to make any decisions about the authorship of *The Bloody Brother*. The linguistic evidence leaves the matter unresolved, while that from the play's use of blank verse, prose and rhyme is contradictory. The balance here is slightly against Field's authorship of the disputed scenes. While Field seems as likely an author as Chapman for most of Act III on literary grounds, the evidence is more in favour of Jonson for Act IV. Theatrically, the disputed scenes do not seem to read like Field's, but I am unsure. In the end the question of the authorship of *Rollo, Duke of Normandy; or, The Bloody Brother* remains as much of a mystery as its performance and publication history.



## NOTES

1. It is the sixth piece in the collection of fifteen items, on Folios 119-135.
2. *Charlemagne; or, The Distracted Emperor*, [Egerton MS 1994], edited by J.H.Walter, Malone Society (Oxford, 1937 (1938)), p.viii. All references are to this edition of the manuscript. It has also been edited by Franck L.Schoell (Princeton, 1920).
3. The 'tripartite' letter in Field's handwriting is reproduced as Plate XIII of *English Literary Autographs, 1550-1650* (Oxford, 1932). I am also indebted to Dr Jan Piggett of Dulwich College who has supplied me with photographs of two letters in their possession.
4. Morris Palmer Tilley, *A Dictionary of the Proverbs in England in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century* (Ann Arbor, 1950).
5. *The Birth of Merlin*, edited by C.F.Tucker Brooke, in *The Shakespeare Apocrypha* (Oxford, 1908, reprinted 1918), pp.349-82 (p.xlvi). References are to the original quarto and to this edition.
6. *The Coxcomb*, edited by Irby B.Cauthen Jr., in Bowers, I., 261-366. All references are to the original folio text but act and scene numbers from Cauthen are added for convenience.
7. Abraham S.Wolf Rosenbach, 'The Curious Impertinent in English Dramatic Literature before Shelton's Translation of *Don Quixote*', *Modern Language Notes*, 17 (1902), 357-367; *Eliz. Stage*, III, 223; Peery, pp.148-9. For a further account of *The Curious Impertinent* see *The Second Maiden's Tragedy*, edited by Anne Lancashire, *The Revels Plays* (Manchester, 1978), pp.297-301.
8. Ben Jonson, *The Alchemist*, edited by F.H.Mares, *The Revels Plays* (Manchester, 1967), IV.7.41.
9. The date is suggested by the presence of Joseph Taylor and the absence of Ecclestone in the cast list. A similar list accompanies *The Honest Man's Fortune*, which we know from its manuscript to have been played in 1613. Other actors on the list include Field, Reed, Benfield and Attwell, all of whom have well documented associations with Henslowe and with the Lady Elizabeth's company.
10. John Freehafer, 'The Contention for Bussy D'Ambois, 1622-1641', *Theatre Notebook*, 23 (1968/9), 61-69.
11. *Beggars' Bush* is printed on 2K2-2M4 of F.1647, pp.75-96. It has been edited by J.H.Dorenkamp (The Hague, 1967) and by Fredson Bowers in



Bowers, III, 225-362. References are to the page numbers of the original folio text of 1647, but act and scene references are given to the Bowers edition for convenience.

12. Fredson Bowers, '*Beggars' Bush*, a Reconstructed Prompt Book and its Copy', *Studies in Bibliography*, 27 (1974), 113-36. Bowers, III, 228-30.
13. Greg, *Bibliography*, II, 703-5. The play did not appear in F.1647 but was published under the title of *The Bloody Brother* in F.1679. John Jump uses Q2 as his copy text for his edition, and therefore he uses the title *Rollo, Duke of Normandy* (Liverpool, 1948). All quotations are taken from the original quartos but I use Jump's act and scene references for convenience.
14. E.H.C.Oliphant, *The Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher* (New Haven, 1927), pp.457-63; A.H.B[ullen], 'John Fletcher', in *Dictionary of Natural Biography*, reprinted (Oxford 1921-2), VII, 303-311 (p.308), W.W.Greg, 'Some Notes on the Stationers' Registers', *Library*, 7 (1926-7), 376-86.
15. For a full account of the play's sources see Bertha Hensman, *The Shares of Fletcher, Field and Massinger in Twelve Plays of the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon*, Jacobean Drama Studies, 11, 2 vols (Salzburg, 1974), II, 242-79. This chapter on *The Bloody Brother* summarises and revises her treatment of the play in 'John Fletcher's *The Bloody Brother; or, Rollo, Duke of Normandy*' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1947).
16. Oliphant argues for late revision of the play on the grounds of the double title and conflicting evidence about its date. The absence of any licence issued by Sir Henry Herbert suggests to him a date pre 1622, while the *Neptune's Triumph* passage suggests a date post 1624. But double titles do not necessarily imply revision as Oliphant himself later acknowledged. The records relating to Herbert's licences are incomplete. It is not unknown for Jonson to plagiarise. Oliphant, pp.457-8; E.H.C.Oliphant, 'The Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher: some additional note', *Philological Quarterly*, 9 (1930), 7-22 (p.12). Cyrus Hoy also draws attention to discontinuities in the play which suggests to him revision in 'Massinger as Collaborator: The Plays with Fletcher and Others', in *Philip Massinger: A Critical Reassessment*, edited by Douglas Howard (Cambridge, 1985), pp.51-82 (pp.71-2).
17. R.Garnett, 'Ben Jonson's probable authorship of Scene 2, Act IV of Fletcher's *Bloody Brother*', *Modern Philology*, 11 (1904-5), pp.489-95.
18. In any case I am suspicious of an identification so different in kind from the others and would prefer Jump's suggestion of Walter Russe, another almanac maker, had it been possible to be confident about his presence in the London of the early seventeenth century (Jump, p.76). Perhaps the



name has no precise contemporary reference. On the analogy of Subtle in *The Alchemist*, an entirely appropriate name for a Norman astrological trickster would be Rusée - a French word meaning artful, crafty or sly.

19. Jump, p.xii; Hoy, VI, p.56; Hensman, 'Fletcher's *The Bloody Brother*', pp.226ff.
20. Q2 has heavy stopping, lack of prompt book directions, and Latinate stage directions (Jump, pp.xiii-xiv).
21. Q2 also differs from Q1 in using *Omn.* rather than *All* in II.2.
22. Q1, D2r; Q2 F2v-F3r, p.43.
23. In IV.2, for example, Q1 has

the Bell rings  
Exit and enter again  
(Q1, G2r)

Q2 prints      Bells Ring within  
                    Exit Pip. and enter againe.  
                    (Q2, G4r, p.53)

Q2 has *Lator gives each a paper* (C4r, p.21), a direction not given in Q1. But, by contrast, in V.2, Q2's *Exit Lator* and *Exeunt Iuglers* are expanded to *He is led out* and *they are lead out* (Q1, 13v; Q2, K1r-K1v, pp.71-2).

24. *Jac. and Car. Stage*, III, 401-407; Robert Boyle, 'Beaumont, Fletcher and Massinger', *Englische Studien*, 8 (1885), 39-61 (pp.54-7); 'Daborne's Share in the Beaumont and Fletcher Plays', *Englische Studien*, 26 (1899), 352-69 (pp.362-3); G.C.Macaulay, 'Beaumont and Fletcher', in *Cambridge History of English Literature*, edited by A.W.Ward and A.R.Waller, 15 vols reprinted (Cambridge, 1932-3), VI, 107-140; Maurice Chelli, *Etude sur la Collaboration de Massinger avec Fletcher et son Groupe* (Paris, 1926), pp.55-58; Hoy, VI, 56-63.
25. Garnett, pp.489-95; William Wells, 'The Bloody Brother', *Notes and Queries*, 154 (1928), 6-9; Charles Crawford, 'Ben Jonson and The Bloody Brother', *Jahrbuch der Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft*, 41 (1905), 163-76.
26. H.D.Sykes, *Sidelights on Elizabethan Drama* (London, 1924), pp.200-219; Brinkley, pp.140-1.
27. Hoy's figures (VI, 64), show that Chapman's habits vary from comedy to tragedy. In tragedy his language is notably uncontracted but he is not very consistent. For example he is more likely to use *hath* and *doth* to

satisfy tragic decorum, as his avoidance of *em* in tragedies but not comedies also suggests. Also useful for a comparison of Chapman's linguistic forms with Jonson's is D.J.Lake, 'Eastward Ho: Linguistic evidence for authorship', *Notes and Queries*, 28 (1981), 158-166. Hoy deals with Chapman and Jonson in Hoy VI.

28. For a discussion of misplaced apostrophes in *Amends for Ladies* see Johan Gerritsen's edition of *The Honest Man's Fortune*, pp.lxxi-ii.
29. I continue to use the title *The Bloody Brother*, despite the fact that the references here are to Jump's edition. Jump, using Q2 as his copy text, calls the play *Rollo, Duke of Normandy*.
30. See, for example, *Amends*, II.1.167; II.3.55; *Knight of Malta*, I.1, p.72.
31. Herford and Simpson supplement Crawford's parallels with others from *Sejanus* in *The Works of Ben Jonson*, edited by C.H.Herford, Percy and Evelyn Simpson, 11 vols (Oxford, 1925-1952), X, Appendix XXII.



## APPENDIX FOUR

### Field as a Reviser

#### APPENDIX FOUR: Field as a Reviser

There are two plays with which Field's name has been associated as reviser: *Timon of Athens* and *Bussy D'Ambois*.<sup>1</sup> He can have no claim to the first. Nothing in *Timon of Athens*' date or provenance allows this. The disputed scenes show no sign of his presence. The Arden editor, H.J.Oliver, finds no evidence of divided authorship, and John Jowett, in the Oxford edition, attributes the play to Shakespeare and Middleton.<sup>2</sup> Field's involvement may be safely dismissed as an intriguing but irrelevant speculation.

The case for Field's authorship of the revisions to Chapman's *Bussy D'Ambois* is more tenable. He has connections as an actor with the play - his performance as Bussy was renowned. The play's movement, perhaps illicitly, from company to company is consonant with Field's.<sup>3</sup> Parrott suggests that the revisions were made for a Whitefriars performance by Chapman but with the 'expert theatrical help' of Field (Parrott, 'Date', p.134). He then, at Field's request, wrote *The Revenge of Bussy D'Ambois* as a companion piece. Peter Ure attributes an anxious 'fidgeting' about with the text to Chapman 'with the advice of' Nathan Field, and Nicholas Brooke goes further by positing two revisions, one by Chapman and, possibly, one by Field.<sup>4</sup> Field's contribution is, as one might expect, thought to be wholly theatrically based. The tendency of the changes is 'to be "theatrical" in a bad sense' (Brooke, lxix), turning, for example, the last act 'from tragedy into melodrama (rigged out with tragic trappings)' (Brooke, lxix). Brooke is 'forced to postulate that the other reviser could write in Chapman's manner, and sometimes do it well' (Brooke, lxxi).

But presumably Nicholas Brooke's 'not-Chapman' with 'qualifications...which only Chapman could possess' could indeed be



Chapman himself (Brooke, lxxi). This is the view of Robert Lordi who feels that the revisions 'bear the stamp of Chapman's genius' and of Albert Tricomi who sees the revised *Bussy D'Ambois* and *The Revenge of Bussy D'Ambois* as plays deliberately written together to create 'thematic counterpoint'.<sup>5</sup>

I have found it impossible to judge between the two ideas - Chapman as reviser, or Field imitating Chapman as reviser. Certainly the revisions have interesting features also found in Field's work - the most notable being the use of Latin for the stage directions, and, in particular the use of *exiturus*. On the other hand the simplest explanation seems the most reasonable - that Chapman himself was responsible for the revisions. These are fairly thorough ranging from the substitution of single words and short phrases to deletions and the addition of passages of up to sixty lines. Some passages are relocated. In Act V scenes are transposed.<sup>6</sup> These changes could all be authorial.

In the end I have been guided by pragmatism in reaching a not proven verdict. For all practical purposes there is insufficient material in these revisions to provide comparative samples of sufficient length. Even if I could be sure they were Field's - and I cannot be - nothing useful would be added to his canon. For the purposes of this thesis Field's putative authorship of the revisions of *Bussy D'Ambois* must remain a fascinating byway.

## NOTES

1. His name was originally suggested by T.M.Parrott. 'The Date of Chapman's *Bussy D'Ambois*', *MLR*, 3 (1908), 126-40 (p.134); *The Problem of Timon of Athens*, Shakespeare Association Papers, 10 (London, 1923).
2. *Timon of Athens*, edited by H.J.Oliver, Arden (London, 1959) and edited by John Jowett in *The Complete Works*, edited by Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor (Oxford, 1986), pp.997-1024 (p.997). See also Gary Taylor, 'The date and auspices of the additions to *Sir Thomas More*', in *Shakespeare and Sir Thomas More: Essays on the Play and its Shakespearian Interest*, edited by T.H.Howard-Hill (Cambridge, 1989), pp.101-29 (p.121).
3. John Freehafer, 'The Contention for *Bussy D'Ambois*, 1622-1641', *Theatre Notebook*, 23 (1968/9), 61-69.
4. Peter Ure, 'Chapman's *Tragedy of Bussy D'Ambois*: Problems of the Revised Quarto', *MLR*, 48 (1953), 257-69 (p.257); George Chapman, *Bussy D'Ambois*, edited by Nicholas Brooke, *The Revels Plays* (London, 1964, reprinted Manchester, 1979).
5. George Chapman, *Bussy D'Ambois* and *The Revenge of Bussy D'Ambois*: Joint Performance in Thematic Counterpoint', *ELH*, 9 (1972), 253-62 (p.254 and p.257).
6. George Chapman, 'Bussy D'Ambois A Tragedie', edited by John Hazel Smith in *The Plays of George Chapman: The Tragedies*, edited by Allan Holaday (Cambridge, 1987), pp.7-263 (p.15).



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Bibliography includes works mentioned in the text, and a small selection of others found useful in preparing this thesis. Where there are recurrent references to the same publications short titles are given in the form listed in the table of abbreviations.

### Section 1: Primary Texts

(i)

- Beaumont, Francis and John Fletcher, *Comedies and Tragedies written by Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher Gentlemen, Never published before, And now published by the Authours Originall Copies* (London, 1647)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Fifty Comedies and Tragedies written by Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher. All in one Volume. Published by the Authors Original Copies, the Songs to each Play being added* (London, 1679)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Works of Beaumont and Fletcher: with an introduction and explanatory notes by Henry Weber, Est, 14 vols* (Edinburgh, 1812)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Works of Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher, edited by Arnold Glover and A.R.Waller, 10 vols* (Cambridge, 1905-12)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Works of Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher, Variorum edition, 4 vols* (London, 1905)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon, edited by Fredson Bowers, 7 vols* (Cambridge, 1966- )
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Beggars Bush, written by Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher gentlemen* (London, 1661)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Beggars Bush, edited by Fredson Bowers in Bowers, III, pp.225-362*
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Coxcomb in F.1647, pp.97-119*
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Coxcomb, edited by Irby B.Cauthen Jr., in Bowers, I, pp.261-366*
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Foure Plays (or Morall Representations in One), in F.1647, pp.25-388*
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Four Plays or Moral Representations in One, in Waller, X, pp.287-48*
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Honest Man's Fortune in F.1647, pp.149-72*
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Honest Man's Fortune in Waller, X, pp.202-78*
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Honest Man's Fortune; A Critical Edition of MS Dyce 9, edited by J.Gerritsen (Djarkarta, Groningen, 1952)*
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Knight of Malta in F.1647, pp.71-95*
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Knight of Malta in Waller, VII, pp.78-163*
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Queene of Corinth in F.1647, pp.1-23*
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Queen of Corinth in Waller, VI, pp.1-78*
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Birth of Merlin, edited by C.F.Tucker Brooke, in The Shakespeare Apocrypha* (Oxford, 1908, reprinted 1918), pp.349-82



- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Bloody Brother, A Tragedy*. By B.J.F. (London, 1639)
- Chapman, George, *Bussy D'Ambois* (London, 1641)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Bussy D'Ambois*, edited by Nicholas Brooke, *The Revels Plays* (London, 1964, reprinted Manchester, 1979)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Bussy D'Ambois*, edited by Robert J. Lordi, *Regents Renaissance Drama* (London, 1964)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Bussy D'Ambois*, edited by Maurice Evans, *New Mermaids* (London, 1965)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Bussy D'Ambois: A Tragedie*, edited by John Hazel Smith in *The Plays of George Chapman: The Tragedies*, edited by Allan Holaday, assisted by G. Blakemore Evans and Thomas L. Berger (Cambridge, 1987), pp. 7-263
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Charlemagne; or, The Distracted Emperor*, edited by John Henry Walter, *Malone Society* (Oxford, 1937 (1938))
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Faithful Friends*, edited by G. M. Pinciss and G. R. Proudfoot, *Malone Society* (London, 1970 (1975))
- Field, Nathan, *Amends for Ladies: A Comedie as it was acted at the Blacke-Fryers, both by the Princes Servants, and the Lady Elizabeths* by Nat. Field (London, 1618)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Amends for Ladies with the Humour of Roring. A Comedie. As it was acted at the Blacke Fryers, both by the Princes Servants and the Lady Elizabeths. By Nat. Field* (London, 1618)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Amends for Ladies, with the merry pranks of Moll Cut-Purse: Or, the humour of roaring: A Comedy Full of honest mirth and wit. As it was Acted at the Blacke-Fryers, both by the Princes Servants and the Lady Elizabeths. By Nath. Field* (London, 1632)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Amends for Ladies*, edited by John Payne Collier (London, 1829)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *A Woman is a Weather-cocke, A New Comedy, As it was acted before the King in White-Hall And divers times Privately at the White-Friers, By the Children of her Majesties Revels, Written by Nat: Field* (London, 1612)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *A Woman is a Weathercock*, edited by John Payne Collier (London, 1829)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Plays of Nathan Field*, edited by William Peery (Austin, 1950)
- Fletcher, John, *Rollo, Duke of Normandy*, edited by John Jump (Liverpool, 1948)
- Fletcher, John and Philip Massinger, *Beggars Bush*, edited by John H. Dorenkamp (The Hague, 1967)
- Fletcher, John, Philip Massinger and Nathan Field, *The Knight of Malta*, edited with an Introduction and Notes by Marianne Brock (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Bryn Mawr College, 1944)
- Massinger, Philip and Nathan Field, *The Fatall dowry: a tragedy as it hath beene often acted at the private house in Blackefryers by his Majesties servants written by P.M. and N.F.* (London, 1632)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Fatal Dowry*, edited by C. L. Lockert Jr (Lancaster, Pa., 1918)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Fatal Dowry*, edited by T. A. Dunn, *Fountainwell Drama Texts* (Edinburgh, 1969)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Fatal Dowry*, edited by Carol Bishop, *Salzburg Studies in English Literature*, 63 (Salzburg, 1976)



- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Fatal Dowry*, edited by Philip Edwards in *The Plays and Poems of Philip Massinger*, edited by Philip Edwards and Colin Gibson, 5 vols (Oxford, 1976), I, 1-95 and V, 96-110
- Massinger, Philip, *The Fatal Dowry: A Tragedy, altered and adapted [by Richard Sheil] for Representation as performed at the Theatre-Royal, Drury Lane, January 5, 1825* (London, 1825)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Dramatic Works of Philip Massinger*, edited by John Monck Mason (London, 1779)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Plays and Poems of Philip Massinger*, edited by Philip Edwards and Colin Gibson, 5 vols (Oxford, 1976)
- Shakespeare, William, *Timon of Athens*, edited by H.J.Oliver, Arden (London, 1959)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Shakespeare Apocrypha: Being a Collection of Fourteen Plays which have been ascribed to Shakespeare*, edited by C.F.Tucker Brooke (Oxford, 1908, reprinted 1918)

(ii)

- Field, Nathan, [*Feild the Players Letter*]. *The Remonstrance of Field addressed to a preacher in Southwark who had been arraigning against the players at the Globe theatre in the year 1616, now first edited from the original manuscript by J.O.Halliwell[-Phillips]* (London, 1865) reprinted in his *Illustrations of the Life of Shakespeare*, Transactions of the New Shakspere Society (London, 1865), Item 23, pp.115-17
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'To his worthy beloved friend Mr Ben Jonson', in Ben Jonson, *Catiline his Conspiracy* (London, 1611)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'To my lov'd Friend M.John Fletcher on his Pastoral' in John Fletcher *The Faithfull Shepardesse* (London, 1609?)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'To the worthiest Maister Ionson', in Ben Jonson, *Volpone or The Fox* (London, 1607)

## Section 2: Plays and Entertainments

- Beaumont, Francis, *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*, edited by Sheldon Zitner, *The Revels Plays* (Manchester, 1984)
- Beaumont, Francis and John Fletcher, *Bonduca*, edited by Cyrus Hoy, in Bowers, IV, pp.149-259
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Captain*, edited by L.A.Beaurline, in Bowers, I, pp.541-670
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Chances*, edited by George Walton Williams, in Bowers, IV, pp.541-645
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Cupid's Revenge*, edited by Fredson Bowers in Bowers, II, pp.315-448
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Custom of the Country*, in Waller, I, pp.302-388



- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Double Marriage*, in Waller, VI, pp.321-407
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Elder Brother*, edited by W.W.Greg in *The Works of Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher*, Variorum edition, 4 vols (London, 1905), II, pp.1-100
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Faithful Shepherdess*, edited by Cyrus Hoy, in Bowers, III, pp.483-612
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The False One* in Waller, III, pp.300-372
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Humorous Lieutenant*, edited by Cyrus Hoy in Bowers, V, pp.289-440
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Island Princess*, edited by George Walton Williams, in Bowers, V, pp.539-670
- \_\_\_\_\_, *A King and No King*, edited by George Walton Williams, in Bowers II, pp.167-314
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Little French Lawyer*, in Waller, III, pp.373-454
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Love's Pilgrimage*, edited by L.A.Beaurline, in Bowers, II, pp.567-695
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Loyal Subject*, edited by Fredson Bowers, in Bowers, V, pp.151-288
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Mad Lover*, edited by Robert Kean Turner, in Bowers, V, pp.1-149
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Maid's Tragedy*, edited by Robert K.Turner, in Bowers, II, pp.1-166
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Maid's Tragedy*, edited by T.W.Craik, *The Revels Plays* (Manchester, 1988)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Monsieur Thomas; or, Father's Own Son*, edited by Hans Walter Gabler, in Bowers IV, pp.415-540
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Nice Valour; or, The Passionate Madman*, edited by George Walton Williams, in Bowers, VII, pp.425-512
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Night Walker; or, The Little Thief*, edited by Cyrus Hoy, in Bowers, VII, pp.513-637
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Noble Gentleman*, edited by L.A.Beaurline, in Bowers, III, pp.113-223
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Philaster; or, Love lies a-Bleeding*, edited by Andrew Gurr, *The Revels Plays* (London, 1969)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Philaster; or, Love lies a-Bleeding*, edited by Robert K.Turner, in Bowers, I, pp.367-540
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Pilgrim*, edited by Cyrus Hoy, in Bowers, VI, pp.111-224
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Scornful Lady*, edited by Cyrus Hoy, in Bowers, II, pp.449-565
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Spanish Curate*, edited by R.B.McKerrow, in *The Works of Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher*, Variorum edition, 4 vols (London, 1905), II, pp.101-228
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Thierry and Theodore*, edited by Robert K.Turner Jnr, in Bowers, III, pp.363-481
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Valentinian*, edited by Robert K.Turner Jnr, in Bowers, IV, pp.261-414
- \_\_\_\_\_, *A Very Woman; or, The Prince of Tarent*, edited by Hans Walter Gabler in Bowers, VII, pp.639-743
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Wild Goose Chase*, edited by Fredson Bowers, in Bowers, VI pp.225-353



- \_\_\_\_\_, *Wit without Money*, edited by Hans Walter Gabler, in Bowers, VI, pp.1-109
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Wit at Several Weapons*, edited by Robert Kean Turner, in Bowers, VII, pp.299-424
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Woman's Prize; or, The Tamer Tamed*, edited by Fredson Bowers, in Bowers, IV, pp.1-154
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Women Pleased*, edited by Hans Walter Gabler, in Bowers, V, pp.441-538
- Campion, Thomas, *The Lord's Masque*, edited by I.A.Shapiro, in *A Book of Masques: In Honour of Allardyce Nicoll*, edited by T.J.B.Spencer and S.W.Wells (Cambridge, 1967), pp.95-123
- Chapman, George, *The Conspiracy and Tragedy of Byron*, edited by John Margeson, *The Revels Plays* (Manchester, 1988)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Memorable Masque*, edited by G.Blakemore Evans in *The Plays of George Chapman: The Comedies*, edited by Allan Holaday (Urbana, Chicago and London, 1970), pp.557-86
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Widow's Tears*, edited by Akihiro Yamada, *The Revels Plays* (Manchester, 1975)
- Chapman, George, Ben Jonson, John Marston, *Eastward Ho*, edited by R.W.Van Fossen, *The Revels Plays* (Manchester, 1979)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Costlie Whore*, edited by A.H.Bullen, *A Collection of Old English Plays*, 4 vols (London, 1882-5), IV (1885), 219-98
- Coward, Noel, *Present Laughter in Plays: Four*, *The Master Playwrights* (London, 1979), pp.133-247
- Daborne, Robert, *A Christian Turn'd Turk; or, The Two Famous Pirates, Ward and Dansiker* in A.E.H.Swaen, 'Robert Daborne's Plays', *Anglia*, 20 (1898), 153-256
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Poor-Mans Comfort* in 'Robert Daborne's Plays', *Anglia*, 21 (1898), 373-440
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Poor Man's Comfort*, edited by Kenneth Palmer, *Malone Society* (Oxford, 1954 (1955))
- Dekker, T. and Robert Daborne, *If it be not Good, the Devil is in It; If this be not a good play the Devil is in it*, in *The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker*, edited by Fredson Bowers, 4 vols (Cambridge, 1953-61), III (1958), 113-223
- Dekker, T. and P.Massinger, *The Virgin Martyr*, in *The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker*, edited by Fredson Bowers, 4 vols (Cambridge, 1953-61), III (1958), 365-480
- Fletcher, John, *The Faithful Shepardsse* (London, 1609 [?])
- Fletcher, John and William Shakespeare, *Henry VIII; or, All is True*, edited by Fredson Bowers, in Bowers, VII, pp.1-144
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Two Noble Kinsmen*, edited by Fredson Bowers, in Bowers, VII, pp.145-298
- Hill, Aaron, *The Insolvent; or, Filial Piety*, in *The Dramatic Works of A.H.*, 2 vols (London, 1760), II, 329-88
- Jonson, Ben, *The Works of Ben Jonson*, edited by C.H.Herford, Percy and Evelyn Simpson, 11 vols (Oxford, 1925-52)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Bartholomew Fair*, edited by E.A.Horsman, *The Revels Plays*



- (London, 1960)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Cynthia's Revels*, in *The Works of Ben Jonson*, edited by C.H.Herford, Percy and Evelyn Simpson, 11 vols (Oxford, 1925-52) IV, 3-184
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Devil is an Ass*, in *The Works of Ben Jonson*, edited by C.H.Herford, Percy and Evelyn Simpson, 11 vols (Oxford, 1925-52) VI, 153-270
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Epicoene; or, The Silent Woman*, edited by R.V.Holdsworth, New Mermaids (London, 1979)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Every Man Out of his Humour*, in *The Works of Ben Jonson*, edited by C.H.Herford, Percy and Evelyn Simpson, 11 vols (Oxford, 1925-52), III, 507-604
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Poetaster*, in *The Works of Ben Jonson*, edited by C.H.Herford, Percy and Evelyn Simpson, 11 vols (Oxford, 1925-52), IV, 187-325
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Volpone; or, The Fox*, in *The Works of Ben Jonson*, edited by C.H.Herford and Percy Simpson, 11 vols (Oxford, 1925-52), V, 1-137
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Volpone*, edited by Philip Brockbank, New Mermaid (London, 1968)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Volpone*, edited by Brian Parker, *The Revels Plays* (Manchester, 1983)
- Kyd, Thomas, *The Spanish Tragedy* (London, 1615)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Spanish Tragedy* (London, 1618)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Spanish Tragedy* (London, 1623)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Spanish Tragedy* (London, 1633)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Spanish Tragedy*, edited by Andrew S.Cairncross, *Regents Renaissance Drama* (Nebraska, 1967)
- Marston, John, *The Malcontent*, edited by G.K.Hunter, *The Revels Plays* (London, 1975)
- Marston, John and William Barksted, *The Insatiate Countess*, edited by Giorgio Melchiori, *The Revels Plays* (Manchester, 1984)
- Middleton, Thomas, *The Works of Thomas Middleton*, edited by A.H.Bullen, 8 vols (London, 1886)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Civitatis Amor* in *The Works of Thomas Middleton*, edited by A.H.Bullen, 8 vols (London, 1886), VII, 267-290
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Hengist, King of Kent; or, The Mayor of Queensborough*, edited by R.C.Bald (New York and London, 1938)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Inner Temple Masque; or The Masque of Heroes*, in *The Works of Thomas Middleton*, edited by A.H.Bullen, 8 vols (London, 1886), VII, 197-216
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Triumph of Love and Antiquity* in *The Works of Thomas Middleton*, edited by A.H.Bullen, 8 vols (London, 1886), VII, 308-32
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Triumphs of Truth* in *The Works of Thomas Middleton*, edited by A.H.Bullen, 8 vols (London, 1886), VII, 227-262
- Middleton, Thomas and Thomas Dekker, *The Roaring Girl*, edited by Paul Mulholland, *The Revels Plays* (Manchester, 1987)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Nero*, edited by Elliot McNeal Hill (New York and London, 1979)
- Porter, Henry, *Two Angry Women of Abington* (London, 1599)
- Rowe, Nicholas, *The Fair Penitent*, edited by Malcolm Goldstein, *Regents*



- Restoration Drama (Nebraska, London, 1969)  
*The Second Maiden's Tragedy*, edited by Anne Lancashire, The Revels Plays (Manchester, 1978)
- Shakespeare, William, *Mr William Shakespeare Comedies, Histories, & Tragedies Published according to the True Originall Copies* (London, 1623)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Hamlet, The First Quarto 1603*, edited by Albert B. Weiner (New York, 1962)  
*Sir John van Olden Barnavelt*, edited by T.H. Howard-Hill, Malone Society (Oxford, 1979 (1980))
- Stoppard, Tom, *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead*, second edition (London, 1968)  
*Swetnam, the Woman Hater Arraigned by Women*, edited by A.B. Grosart, Occasional Issues of Unique or Very Rare Books, 14 (Manchester, 1880)  
*Two Noble Ladies and the Converted Conjuror*, edited by Rebecca Rhoads, Malone Society (Oxford, 1930)
- Webster, John, *The Duchess of Malfi*, edited by John Russell Brown, The Revels Plays (London, 1964)
- Webster, John and Thomas Heywood, *Appius and Virginia* (London, 1654)  
*Wit's Triumvirate*, edited by Cathryn Anne Nelson, Salzburg Studies in English Literature, 57 (Salzburg, 1975)  
*The Wonder of Women; or The Tragedie of Sophonisba in Three Jacobean Witchcraft Plays*, edited by P. Corbin and D. Sedge, Revels Companion Library (Manchester, 1986)

### Section 3

- Adams, Joseph Quincey, eds., *The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert, Master of the Revels, 1623-1673* (New Haven, 1917)
- Appleton, W.W., *Beaumont and Fletcher: A Critical Study* (London, 1956)
- Arber, Edward, ed., *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554-1640*, 5 vols (London, 1975-94)
- Armstrong, E.A., *Shakespeare's Imagination* (London, 1946)
- Armstrong, W.A., "'Canopy' in Elizabethan Theatrical Terminology", *Notes and Queries*, ns.4, 433-4
- Ashley, Leonard, 'Nathan Field', in *Renaissance Drama*, edited by D.A. Traversi (London, 1980)
- Astington, John Harold, 'The Staging of the Beaumont and Fletcher Collaborations, 1606-1616' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto, 1974)
- Ayers, P.K., 'Dreams of the City: The Urban and the Urbane in Jonson's *Epicoene*', *Philological Quarterly*, 66 (1987), 73-86
- Bald, R.C., *Bibliographical Studies in the Beaumont and Fletcher Folio of 1647*, Supplement No. 13 to *The Library* (Oxford, 1938 (for 1937))
- Baldwin, T.W., *The Organization and Personnel of the Shakespearian*



- Company (New York, 1927)
- Barthelmy, A.G., *Black Face: Maligned Race. The Representation of Blacks in English Drama from Shakespeare to Southerne* (Baton Rouge, La., and London, 1987)
- Barton, Anne, *Ben Jonson, Dramatist* (Cambridge, 1984)
- Bayne, Ronald, 'Lesser Jacobean and Caroline Dramatists', in *Cambridge History of English Literature*, edited by A.W.Ward and A.R.Waller, reprinted, 15 vols (Cambridge, 1932-3), VI, 210-40
- Beckerman, Bernard, *Theatrical Presentation: Performer, Audience and Act*, edited by Gloria Brim Beckerman and William Coco (New York and London, 1990)
- Bellan, H. du, *Les Nouvelles de Cervantes* (Paris, 1615)
- Bentley, G.E., *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage*, 7 vols (Oxford, 1941-68)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Profession of Dramatist in Shakespeare's Time, 1590-1642* (Princeton, 1971)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Profession of Player in Shakespeare's Time, 1590-1642* (Princeton, 1984)
- Berger, Thomas L. and William C. Bradford Jr., *An Index of Characters in English Printed Drama to the Restoration* (Englewood, Colorado, 1975)
- Berry, Ralph, 'Masques and Dumbshows in Webster's Plays' in *Elizabethan Theatre*, VII, edited by George Hibbard (Waterloo, 1981), 124-46
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Shakespeare and the Awareness of Audience* (London, 1985)
- Bethell, S.L., *Shakespeare and the Popular Dramatic Tradition* (London, 1944)
- Birch, T., *The Court and Times of James the First. Illustrated by authentic and confidential letters, from various public and private collections* (London, 1848)
- Blake, Ann, 'The Humour of Children: John Marston's Plays in the Private Theatre', *RES*, ns.38 (1987), 471-82
- Bland, D.S. ed., *Three Revels from the Inns of Court* (Avebury, 1984)
- Boas, F.S., *An Introduction to Stuart Drama* (London, 1946)
- Bond, R. Warwick, 'On six plays in Beaumont and Fletcher, 1679', *RES*, 11 (1935), 257-275
- Booth, Stephen, 'Speculations on doubling in Shakespeare's Plays', in *Shakespeare, The Theatrical Dimension*, edited by Philip C. McGuire and David A. Samuelson (New York, 1979), pp.103-31
- Bowers, Fredson, 'Beggars' Bush; A Reconstructed Prompt Book and its Copy', *Studies in Bibliography*, 27 (1974), 113-36
- Boyle, R., 'Daborne's Share in the Beaumont and Fletcher Plays', *Englische Studien*, 26 (1899), 352-69
- Boyle, Robert, 'Beaumont, Fletcher and Massinger', *Transactions of the New Shakspeare Society*, 8-10
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Beaumont, Fletcher and Massinger', *Englische Studien*, 5 (1882), 74-96
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Beaumont, Fletcher and Massinger', *Englische Studien*, 7 (1884), 66-87
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Beaumont, Fletcher and Massinger', *Englische Studien*, 8 (1885),



- 39-61
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Beaumont, Fletcher and Massinger', *Englische Studien*, 9 (1886), 209-39
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Beaumont, Fletcher and Massinger', *Englische Studien*, 10 (1887), 383-412
- Bradbrook, M.C., 'The Triple Bond: Audience, Actors, Author in the Elizabethan Playhouse', in *The Triple Bond, Plays Mainly Shakespearean in Performance*, edited by J.G.Price (London and University Park, 1970), pp.50-69
- Bradbrook, Muriel, *Growth and Structure of Elizabethan Comedy*, new edition (New York, 1973)
- Bradby, David, 'Introduction [to Part 2]', in *Performance and Politics in Popular Drama*, edited by David Bradby, Louis James and Bernard Sharratt (Cambridge, 1980), 167-172
- Braunmuller, A.R., 'Chapman's *Bussy D'Ambois* and Field's *Amends for Ladies*', *Notes and Queries*, 26 (1979), 401-3
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed., *A Seventeenth-Century Letter-Book. A Facsimile Edition of Folger MS V.a.321 with Transcript, Annotation and Commentary* (Newark, 1983)
- Bridges-Adams, W., *The Irresistible Theatre. From the Conquest to the Commonwealth* (London, 1957)
- Brinkley, Roberta F., *Nathan Field, the Actor-Playwright* (New Haven, 1928)
- Brissenden, Alan, *Shakespeare and the Dance* (London, 1981)
- Brown, Ivor, *Shakespeare and the Actors* (London, 1970)
- B[ullen], A.H., 'John Fletcher', in *Dictionary of National Biography*, reprinted in 22 vols (Oxford, 1921-2), VII, 303-11
- Butler, Martin, *Theatre and Crisis, 1632-1642* (Cambridge, 1984)
- Byrne, M.St Clare, 'Anthony Munday's Spelling as a Literary Clue', *The Library*, 4th series, 4 (1923-4), 9-23
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Bibliographic Clues in Collaborate Plays', *The Library*, 4th series, 13 (1932), 21-48
- Carson, Neil, *A Companion to Henslowe's Diary* (Cambridge, 1988)
- Cauthen Jr., Irby B., 'Nathan Field', in *Jacobean and Caroline Dramatists*, edited by Fredson Bowers, *Dictionary of Literary Biography*, 58 (Detroit, Michigan, 1987), pp.86-90
- Cervantes Savaedra, Miguel, *Exemplarie nouells. Turned into English by Don Diego Puede-Ser [J.Mabbe]* (London, 1640)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The History of Don Quixote* [Tr. T.Shelton] (London, 1612)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Novelas Exemplares* (Madrid, 1613)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Novelas Exemplares*, edited by F.R.Marin, 2 vols (Madrid, 1914-17)
- Chambers, E.K., *The Elizabethan Stage*, 4 vols (Oxford, 1923)
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed., 'Four Letters on Theatrical Affairs', in *Collections*, Malone Society (Oxford, 1923) II, Part 2, pp.145-49
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed., 'Plays of the King's Men in 1641' in *Collections*, Malone Society (Oxford, 1911), I, Parts 4 and 5, pp.364-69
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Review of Frank Marcham's *The Kings Office of the Revels, 1610-1622*', *RES*, 1 (1925) 479-484
- \_\_\_\_\_, *William Shakespeare*, 2 vols (Oxford, 1930)



- Chambers, E.K. and W.W.Greg, eds., in *Collections*, Malone Society (Oxford, 1909) I, Part 3, pp.260-84
- \_\_\_\_\_, eds., 'Dramatic Records from the Privy Council Register 1603-1642', in *Collections*, Malone Society (Oxford, 1911), I, Parts 4 and 5, pp.370-395
- \_\_\_\_\_, eds., 'Dramatic Records of the City of London: The Remembrancia, in *Collections*, Malone Society, I, Part 1 (Oxford, 1907), pp.43-100
- Chambers, R.W., 'The expression of ideas - particularly political ideas - in the three pages and in Shakespeare' in *Shakespeare's Hand in the Play of Sir Thomas More*, edited by A.W.Pollard and others (Cambridge, 1923), pp.142-87
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Man's Unconquerable Mind* (London, 1939)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Some sequences of thought in Shakespeare and in the 147 lines of *Sir Thomas More*', *MLR*, 26 (1931), 251-80
- Chapman, George, 'To his Loved sonne, Nat. Field and his Wether-cocke Woman', frontmatter to Nathan Field, *A Woman is a Weather-Cock* (London, 1612)
- Charney, Maurice, 'The Children's Plays in Performance', *RORD*, 18 (1975), 19-23
- Chelli, Maurice, *Le Drame de Massinger* (Lyon, 1923)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Etude sur la Collaboration de Massinger avec Fletcher et son Groupe* (Paris, 1926)
- Chew, Samuel C., *The Crescent and the Rose, Islam and England During the Renaissance* (New York, 1937)
- Child, Harold, 'Dramatic Revivals 1901-18, 1926', *RES*, 3 (1927), 169-85
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Revivals of English Dramatic Works, 1919-25', *RES*, 2 (1926), 177-88
- Clark, Andrew, 'An Annotated list of Lost Domestic Plays, 1578-1624', *RORD*, 18 (1975), 29-44
- Clark, S., ed., *Shakespeare Dictionary* (London, 1986)
- Cockayne, Aston, *Small Poems of Divers Sorts: A Chain of Golden Poems* (London, 1658)
- Colley, John Scott, 'Music in the Elizabethan Private Theatres', *Yearbook of English Studies*, 4 (1974), 62-69
- Cook, Ann Jennalie, *The Privileged Playgoers of Shakespeare's London; 1576-1642* (Princeton, NJ, 1981)
- Cook, David and F.P.Wilson, eds., *Dramatic Records in the Declared Accounts of the Treasurer of the Chamber, 1558-1642*, Malone Society Collections, 6 (Oxford, 1962)
- Coryate, Thomas, Thomas Coriate, *Traveller for the English Wits: Greeting. From the Court of the Great Mogul, Resident at the Towne of Asmere, in Easterne India* (London, 1616)
- Craik, T.W., *The Comic Tales of Chaucer* (London, 1964)
- Crawford, Charles, 'Ben Jonson and *The Bloody Brother*', *Jahrbuch der Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft*, 41 (1905), 163-76
- Cruikshank, A., *Philip Massinger* (Oxford, 1920)



- Crum, Margaret, ed., *First-Line Index of English Poetry, 1500-1800 in Manuscripts of the Bodleian Library*, Oxford (Oxford, 1969)
- David, Richard, *Shakespeare in the Theatre* (Cambridge, 1978)
- Davison, Peter, *Contemporary Drama and the Popular Drama Tradition in England* (London, 1982)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Popular Appeal in English Drama to 1850* (New Jersey, 1982)
- Dawson, Giles E., *Records of Plays and Players in Kent, 1450-1642*, Malone Society Collections, 7 (Oxford, 1965)
- Dessen, Alan C., *Elizabethan Drama and the Viewer's Eye* (Chapel Hill, 1977)
- Dollerup, C., 'Danish Costume on the Elizabethan Stage', *RES*, ns.25 (1974), 53-58
- Dominik, Mark, *William Shakespeare and the Birth of Merlin* (Beaverton, Oregon, 1985/1991)
- Douglas, Audrey and Peter Greenfield, eds., *Cumberland, Westmorland, Gloucestershire*, Records of Early English Drama (Toronto, Buffalo, London, 1986)
- Downer, Alan S., *The Eminent Tragedian: William Charles Macready* (London, 1966)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Prolegomenon to the Study of Elizabethan Acting', *Maske und Kothurn*, 10 (1964), 625-36
- Downes, J., *Roscus Anglicanus* (1708), edited by Judith Milhous and Robert D.Hume (London, 1987)
- Drake, Nathan, *Shakespeare and his Times, including the Biography of the Poet; Criticisms on his genius and writings; a new Chronology of his plays; a disquisition on the object of his Sonnets* (London, 1819)
- Dunn, T.A., *Philip Massinger, The Man and the Playwright* (London, 1957)
- Dutton, Richard, *William Shakespeare, A Literary Life* (London, 1989)
- Edmunds, John, 'Shakespeare breaks the Illusion', in *Shakespeare's Wide and Universal Stage*, edited by C.B.Cox and D.J.Palmer (Manchester, 1984), pp.32-47
- Edwards, Philip, 'The Danger not the Death: The Art of John Fletcher', in *Jacobean Theatre*, edited by John Russell Brown and Bernard Harris, Stratford-upon-Avon Studies, 1 (London, 1960), 159-77
- Ekeblad, Inga-Stina, 'Webster's Constructional Rhythm', *ELH*, 24 (1957), 165-76
- Elam, Keir, *The Semiotics of Theatre and Drama* (London, New York, 1980)
- Eliot, T.S., 'Thomas Heywood', in *Selected Essays*, third edition (London, 1951), pp.171-81
- Erdman, David, 'The Signature of Style', *Bulletin of New York Public Library*, 63 (1959), 88-109
- Evans, G.Blakemore, 'Note on Fletcher and Massinger's *Little French Lawyer*', *Modern Language Notes*, 5 (1937), 406-7
- Ewbank, Inga-Stina, '"More pregnantly than words": Some Uses and Limitations of Visual Symbolism', *Shakespeare Survey*, 24 (1971), 13-18
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'These Pretty Devices: a study of Masques in Plays', in *A Book of Masques in Honour of Allardyce Nicoll*, edited by T.J.B.Spencer and S.W.Wells (Cambridge, 1967), pp.405-48



- Farnham, Willard Edward, 'Colloquial contractions in Beaumont and Fletcher, Massinger and Shakespeare as a Test of Authorship', *PMLA*, 31 (1916), 326-58
- Fenton, Doris, *The Extra-Dramatic Moment in Elizabethan Plays before 1616* (Philadelphia, 1930)
- Fenton, Frank L., 'The Authorship of Acts III and IV of *The Queen of Corinth*', *Modern Language Notes*, 42 (1927), 94-96
- Fleay, F.G., 'Annals of the Career of Nathaniel Field', *Englische Studien*, 13 (1889), 28-36
- \_\_\_\_\_, *A Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama, 1559-1642*, 2 vols (London, 1891)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *A Chronicle History of the London Stage, 1559-1642* (London, 1890)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'On Metrical Tests as Applied to Dramatic Poetry', *Transactions of the New Shakspeare Society*, 1-2 (London, 1874), 51-84
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Shakespeare Manual* (London, 1876)
- Flecknoe, Richard, *Love's Kingdom, A pastoral trage-comedy. Not as it was acted at the Theatre near Lincolns-Inn, but as it was written, and since corrected by Richard Flecknoe. With a short treatise of the English stage, &c.* (London, 1664), reprinted in W.C.Hazlitt, *The English Drama and Stage under the Tudor and Stuart Princes, 1534-1664* (London, 1869), pp.275-81
- Foakes, R.A., 'Tragedy of the Children's Theatres after 1600: A Challenge to the Adult Stage', in *Elizabethan Theatre*, II, edited by David Galloway (Toronto, 1970), pp.37-59
- Foakes, R.A. and R.T.Rickert, eds., *Henslowe's Diary* (Cambridge, 1961)
- Forker, Charles R., 'Webster or Shakespeare? Style, idiom, vocabulary and spelling in the additions to *Sir Thomas More*', in *Shakespeare and Sir Thomas More: Essays on the Play and its Shakespearian Interest*, edited by T.H.Howard-Hill (Cambridge, 1989)
- Forse, James H., 'Extortion in the Name of Art in Elizabethan England: The Impressment of Thomas Clifton for the Queen's Chapel Boys', *Theatre Survey*, 31 (1990), 165-76
- Freehafer, John, 'The Contention for Bussy D'Ambois, 1622-1641', *Theatre Notebook*, 23 (1968/9), 61-69
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Perspective scenery and the Caroline Playhouse', *Theatre Notebook*, 27 (1972/3), 98-113
- Freeburg, V.O., *Disguise Plots in Elizabethan Drama* (New York, 1915)
- Freeman, Rosemary, *English Emblem Books* (London, 1948)
- Gair, Reavley, 'Take Over at Blackfriars: Queens Revels to King's Men', in *Elizabethan Theatre*, X, edited by C.E.McGee (Waterloo, 1988), pp.37-54
- Gair, W.Reavley, *The Children of Paul's: the Story of a Theatre Company, 1553-1608* (Cambridge, 1982)
- Galloway, David, ed., *Norwich, 1540-1642, Records of Early English Drama* (Toronto, Buffalo, London, 1984)
- Galloway, David and John Wasson, eds., *Records of Plays and Players in Norfolk and Suffolk, 1330-1642*, Malone Society Collections, 11



- (Oxford, 1980)
- Garnett, R., 'Ben Jonson's probable authorship of Scene 2 Act IV of Fletcher's *Bloody Brother*', *Modern Philology*, 11 (1905), 489-95
- Gayley, Charles Mill, *Francis Beaumont: Dramatist. A Portrait With Some Account of his Circle, Elizabethan and Jacobean, and of his Association with John Fletcher* (London, 1914)
- Genest, John, *Some Account of the English Stage*, 10 vols (Bath, 1832)
- Gerritsen, Johan, 'The Printing of the Beaumont and Fletcher Folio of 1647', *The Library*, 5th series, 111 (1949), 233-64
- George, B.B., *Stage Lives* (Connecticut, London, 1985)
- George, D., ed., *The Walmesley of Dunkenhall Account*, *Records of Early English Drama*, 10 (Toronto, 1985), 6-15
- Gerschow, Frederic, *Diary of Frederic Gerschow*, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, ns.6 (1892), pp.26-28
- Gibbons, Brian, *Jacobean City Comedy, A Study of Satiric Plays by Jonson, Marston and Middleton* (1968), second edition (London, New York, 1980)
- Goldman, Michael, 'Performer and Role in Marlowe and Shakespeare', in *Shakespeare and the Sense of Performance: Essays in the Tradition of Performance Criticism in Honour of Bernard Beckerman*, edited by Marvin and Ruth Thompson (Newark, London, Toronto, 1989), pp.91-102
- Graves, R.B., 'Elizabethan Lighting Effects and the Conventions of Indoor and Outdoor Theatrical Illumination', *Renaissance Drama*, ns.12 (1981), 51-69
- Gray, Henry D., 'Appius and Virginia' by Webster and Heywood, *Studies in Philology*, 24 (1927), 275-89
- Green, Henry, *Shakespeare and the Emblem Writers: An Exposition of their Similarities of Thought and Expression...* (London, 1870)
- Greg, W.W., ed., *A Bibliography of the English Printed Drama to the Restoration*, 4 vols (London, 1939-59)
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed., *Dramatic Documents from the Elizabethan Playhouses: Stage Plots: Actors' Parts: Prompt Books* (Oxford, 1931, reprinted 1969)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare. A Survey of the Foundations of the Text*, third edition (Oxford, 1954)
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed., *English Literary Autographs, 1550-1650, selected for reproduction and edited by W.W.Greg in collaboration with [others]* (Oxford, 1932)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Evidence of Theatrical Plots for the History of the Elizabethan Stage', *RES*, 3 (1925), 257-274
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Field and the Beaumont and Fletcher Folio of 1679', *RES*, 3 (1927), 337-38
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed., *Henslowe Papers: Being Documents Supplementary to Henslowe's Diary* (London, 1907)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Printing of the Beaumont and Fletcher Folio of 1647', *The Library*, 4th series, 11 (1922), 109-115
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'A Question of + or -', *RES*, VI (1930), 300-04
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Review of S.A.Tannenbaum, *The Booke of Sir Thomas Moore: a Bibliotic Study*', *The Library*, 9 (1928), 202-11



- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Some Notes on the Stationers' Registers', *The Library*, 7 (1926-7), 376-86
- Gurr, Andrew, *Playgoing in Shakespeare's London* (Cambridge, 1987)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Shakespearian Stage, 1574-1642* (Cambridge, 1970)
- Goodwin, John, ed., *Peter Hall's Diaries: The Story of a Dramatic Battle*, (London, 1983)
- Hammond, Antony and Doreen Delvecchio, 'The Melbourne Manuscript and John Webster: A Reproduction and Transcript', *Studies in Bibliography*, 41 (1988), 1-32
- Harbage, Alfred, *Annals of English Drama, 975-1700*, revised by S.Schoenbaum (London, 1964), third edition revised by Sylvia Stoler Wagonheim (New York, London, 1989)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Shakespeare and the Rival Traditions* (New York, 1952)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Shakespeare's Audience* (New York, 1941)
- Hare, Arnold, 'English Comedy', in *Comic Drama: The European Heritage*, edited by W.D.Howarth (London, 1978), pp.122-43
- Hatcher, O.L., 'Fletcher's Habit of Dramatic Collaboration', *Anglia*, 33 (1910), 219-31
- Hattaway, Michael, *Elizabethan Popular Drama: Plays in Performance*, Theatre Production Studies (London, 1982)
- Hazlitt, W.C., *The English Drama and Stage under the Tudor and Stuart Princes, 1534-1664* (London, 1869)
- Hazlitt, William, 'Taylor's Wit and Mirth', in *Shakespeare's Jest-Books*, 3 vols (London, 1864), III, 24-25
- Heinemann, Margot, *Puritanism and Theatre: Thomas Middleton and Opposition Drama under the Early Stuarts* (Cambridge, 1980)
- Hensman, Bertha, 'The Collaboration of Massinger and Fletcher' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oxford, 1960)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'John Fletcher's *The Bloody Brother* or *Rollo, Duke of Normandy* (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Chicago, 1947)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Shares of Fletcher, Field and Massinger in Twelve Plays of the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon*, Jacobean Drama Studies, 6, 2 vols (Salzburg, 1974)
- Hillebrand, H.N., *The Child Actors: A Chapter in Elizabethan Stage History*, University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature (Urbana, 1926)
- Hosking, G.L., *The Life and Times of Edward Alleyn* (London, 1952)
- Hosley, R., 'The Discovery Space in Shakespeare's Globe', *Shakespeare Survey*, 12 (1959), 35-46
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'A Reconstruction of the Second Blackfriars', in *Elizabethan Theatre*, I, edited by David Galloway (Toronto, 1969), pp.74-88
- Howard-Hill, T., ed., *Shakespeare and Sir Thomas More: Essays on the Play and its Shakespearean Interest* (Cambridge, 1989)
- Howarth, W.D., ed., *Comic Drama, The European Heritage* (London, 1978)
- Hoy, Cyrus, 'Massinger as Collaborator: The Plays with Fletcher and Others', in *Philip Massinger: A Critical Reassessment*, edited by Douglas Howard (Cambridge, 1985), pp.51-82
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Shares of Fletcher and his Collaborators in the Beaumont



- and Fletcher Canon, I', *Studies in Bibliography*, 8 (1956), 129-146
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Shares of Fletcher and his Collaborators in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon, II', *Studies in Bibliography*, 9 (1957), 143-162
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Shares of Fletcher and his Collaborators in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon, III', *Studies in Bibliography*, II (1958), 85-106
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Shares of Fletcher and his Collaborators in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon, IV', *Studies in Bibliography* 12 (1959), 91-116
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Shares of Fletcher and his Collaborators in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon, V', *Studies in Bibliography* 13 (1960), 77-108
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Shares of Fletcher and his Collaborators in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon, VI', *Studies in Bibliography* 14 (1961), 45-67
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Shares of Fletcher and his Collaborators in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon, VII', *Studies in Bibliography* 15 (1962), 71-90
- Huebert, Ronald, '"An Artificial Way to Grieve": the Forsaken Woman in Beaumont and Fletcher, Massinger and Field', *ELH*, 44 (1977), 601-21
- Huftel, Sheila, 'The Portrait of Nathan Field', *Contemporary Review*, 238 (1981), 320-25
- Hunter, G.K., 'Flatcaps and Bluecoats: Visual signals on the Elizabethan Stage', *Essays and Studies*, ns.33 (1980), 16-47
- Ingram, R.W., ed., *Coventry, Records of Early English Drama* (Toronto, Buffalo, 1981)
- Jackson, MacDonald P., *Studies in Attribution: Middleton and Shakespeare*, Salzburg Studies in English Literature, 79 (Salzburg, 1979)
- James, Louis, 'Introduction', in *Performance and Politics in Popular Drama*, edited by David Bradby, Louis James and Bernard Sharratt (Cambridge, 1980), pp.1-2
- Jamieson, Michael, 'Shakespeare's Celibate Stage', in *The Seventeenth Century Stage*, edited by G.E.Bentley, Patterns of Literary Criticism (Chicago, 1968), pp.70-93
- Jensen, Ejner, J., 'The boy actors: Plays and playing', *RORD*, 18 (1975), 5-11
- Jewkes, Wilfred, *Act Division in Elizabethan and Jacobean Plays*, 1583-1616 (Connecticut, 1958)
- Johnson, Paula, 'Jacobean Ephemera and the Immortal Word', *Renaissance Drama*, ns.8 (1977), 157-171
- Joseph, Bertram, *Elizabethan Acting* (London, 1951) second edition 1964)
- Kaplan, Joel, H., 'Virtue's holiday: Thomas Dekker and Simon Eyre', *Renaissance Drama*, ns.2 (1969), 103-22
- Kawachi, Yoshiko, *Calendar of English Renaissance Drama, 1558-1642* (New York, London, 1986)
- Kermode, Frank J., 'A Note on the History of Massinger's *The Fatal Dowry* in the Eighteenth Century', *Notes and Queries*, 192 (1947), 186-87
- Knolles, Richard, *The Generall Historie of the Turkes* (London, 1603)
- Lake, David J., *The Canon of Thomas Middleton's Plays: Internal Evidence for the major Problems of Authorship* (Cambridge, 1975)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Eastward Ho: Linguistic Evidence for Authorship', *Notes and Queries*, ns.28 (1981), 158-166
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Histriomastix: Linguistic Evidence for Authorship', *Notes and Queries*, ns.28 (1981), 148-152



- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Insatiate Countess: Linguistic Evidence for Authorship', *Notes and Queries*, ns.28 (1981), 166-70
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Webster's Additions to *The Malcontent*', *Notes and Queries*, ns. 28 (1981), 152-158
- Langbaine, Gerard, *An Account of English Dramatick Poets* (Oxford, 1691)
- Lawless, Donald S. 'Robert Daborne', in *Jacobean and Caroline Dramatists*, edited by Fredson Bowers, *Dictionary of Literary Biography*, 58 (Detroit, 1987), pp.50-59
- Lawrence, W.J., 'A quaint old Playhouse Trick', reprinted in *Speeding up Shakespeare: Studies of the Bygone Theatre and Drama* (London, 1937), pp.89-98
- Leech, Clifford, *Christopher Marlowe, Poet for the Stage*, edited by Anne Lancashire (New York, 1986)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The John Fletcher Plays* (London, 1962)
- Leggatt, Alexander, *Ben Jonson: His Vision and His Art* (London, 1981)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Citizen Comedy in the Age of Shakespeare* (Toronto, 1973)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *English Drama; Shakespeare to the Restoration, 1590-1660* (London, New York, 1988)
- Leinwand, Theodore B., *The City Staged: Jacobean Comedy, 1603-1613* (Madison, Wisconsin, 1986)
- Lomax, Marion, *Stage Images and Traditions: Shakespeare to Ford* (London, 1987)
- McCabe, John, 'A Study of the Blackfriars Theatre, 1608-1642' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Birmingham, 1954)
- Macaulay, G.C., 'Beaumont and Fletcher', in *Cambridge History of English Literature*, edited by A.W.Ward and A.R.Waller, 15 vols (reprinted, Cambridge, 1932-3) VI, 121-154
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Francis Beaumont, A Critical Study* (London, 1883)
- McClure, N.E., ed., *The Letters of John Chamberlain*, 2 vols (Philadelphia, 1939)
- McCormick, John, 'Joseph Bouchardy: a melodramatist and his Public', in *Performance and Politics in Popular Drama*, edited by David Bradby, Louis James and Bernard Sharratt (Cambridge, 1980), pp.33-48
- McElwee, William, *The Murder of Sir Thomas Overbury* (London, 1952)
- McGrath, John, *A Good Night Out, Popular Theatre: Audience, Class and Form* (London, 1981)
- Mack, Maynard, 'Engagement and Detachment in Shakespeare's Plays', in *Essays on Shakespeare and Elizabethan Drama in Honour of Hardin Craig*, edited by Richard Hosley (Columbia, 1962)
- McKerrow, R.B., *Prolegomena for the Oxford Shakespeare: A Study in Editorial Method* (Oxford, 1939)
- Macmillan, Dougald, ed., *Drury Lane Calendar, 1747-1776 compiled from the playbills and edited with an introduction* (Oxford, 1938)
- McMillin, Scott, 'Jonson's Early Entertainments: New Information from Hatfield House', *Renaissance Drama*, ns.1 (1968), 153-66
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Book of Sir Thomas More: date and acting companies', in *Shakespeare and Sir Thomas More, Essays on the Play and its Shakespearian Interest*, edited by T.Howard-Hill (Cambridge,



- 1989), 57-76
- Macon, Antoine de, *Le Decameron de M. Jean Boccace* (Paris, 1614)
- Macready, William, *Reminiscences and Selections from His Diaries and Letters*, edited by Sir Frederick Pollock, 2 vols (London, 1875), I, 301
- Manifold, J.S., *Music in English Drama from Shakespeare to Purcell* (London, 1956)
- Marcham, Frank, *The King's Office of the Revels, 1610-1622* (London, 1925)
- Maxwell, Baldwin, *Studies in Beaumont, Fletcher and Massinger* (Chapel Hill, 1939)
- Mayer, David, 'Towards a Definition of Popular Theatre', in *Western Popular Theatre*, edited by David Mayer and Kenneth Richards (London, New York, 1977), pp.257-77
- Mazer, Cary M., *Shakespeare Refashioned: Elizabethan Plays on Edwardian Stages*, Theatre and Dramatic Studies (Michigan, 1981)
- Meads, Christopher Douglas, 'Banquet Scenes in English Drama, 1585-1642' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Birmingham, 1988)
- Mehl, Dieter, 'Beaumont und Fletcher's *The Faithful Friends*', *Anglia*, 80 (1962), 417-24
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Elizabethan Dumb Show: A History of a Dramatic Convention* (London, 1965)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Emblems in English Renaissance Drama', *Renaissance Drama*, ns.2 (1969), 39-57
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Visual and Rhetorical Imagery in Shakespeare's Plays', *Essays and Studies*, ns. 25 (1972), 83-100
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Mr Cartwright's Pictures: A Seventeenth Century Collection*, Dulwich Picture Gallery (London, 1987)
- Motter, T.H.Vail, *The School Drama in England* (London, 1929)
- Mowat, Barbara A., "'The Getting up of the Spectacle': the Role of the Visual on the Elizabethan Stage 1576-1600", in *Elizabethan Theatre*, IX, edited by George Hibbard (Waterloo, 1981), pp.60-76
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Shakespearian Tragicomedy' in *Renaissance Tragicomedy: Explorations in Genre and Politics*, edited by Nancy Klein Maguire (New York, 1987), pp.80-96
- Muir, Kenneth, *Shakespeare as Collaborator* (London, 1960)
- Murray, John Tucker, *English Dramatic Companies, 1558-1642*, 2 vols (London, 1910)
- Nichols, John, *The Progresses, Processions and Magnificent Festivities of King James the First*, 4 vols (London, 1828)
- Nicoll, Allardyce, *A History of English Drama, 1660-1900*, 6 vols (London, 1952-59)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Passing over the Stage', *Shakespeare Survey*, 12 (1959), 47-55
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Stuart Masques and the Renaissance Stage* (London, 1937)
- Nungezer, Edwin, *A Dictionary of Actors and of other Persons Associated with Public Representations of Plays in England before 1642* (New Haven, 1929)
- Nunn, Trevor, 'From Conference Hall to Theatre', in *This Golden Round:*



- The Royal Shakespeare Theatre at The Swan*, edited by Ronnie Mulryne and Margaret Shewring (Stratford-upon-Avon, 1989), pp.1-8
- Oliphant, E.H.C., *The Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher: An Attempt to Determine their Respective Shares and the Shares of Others* (New Haven, 1927)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher: Some Additional Notes', *Philological Quarterly*, 9 (1930), 7-22
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Works of Beaumont and Fletcher', *Englische Studien*, 14, (1890), 53-94
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Works of Beaumont and Fletcher', *Englische Studien*, 15 (1891), 321-60
- Painter, William, *The Palace of Pleasure* (London, 1566), edited by Joseph Jacobs, 2 vols (London 1890)
- Parker, John, ed., *The Dramatic List: Who's Who in the Theatre: A Biographical Record of the Contemporary Stage*, fifth edition, revised and enlarged (London, 1925)
- Parrott, T.M., 'The Date of Chapman's *Bussy D'Ambois*', *MLR*, 3 (1908), 126-40
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Problem of *Timon of Athens*', *Shakespeare Association Papers*, 10 (1923)
- Partridge, A.C., *The Problems of Henry VIII Reopened* (Cambridge, 1949)
- Paster, Gail Kern, *The Idea of the City in the Age of Shakespeare* (Athens, Ga., 1985)
- Pearse, Nancy Cotton, *John Fletcher's Chastity Plays: Mirrors of modesty* (Lewisburg, 1973)
- Peery, William, 'Eastward Ho and A Woman is a Weathercock', *Modern Language Notes*, 62 (1947), 131-2
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Influence of Ben Jonson on Nathan Field', *Studies in Philology*, 43 (1946), 482-97
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Nid Field was whose Scholar?', *Shakespeare Association Bulletin*, 21 (1946), 80-86
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Portrayal of Women in the Comedies of Nathan Field', *Shakespeare Association Bulletin*, 21 (1946), 129-41
- Pollard, A.W. and G.R.Redgrave and others, *A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland and Ireland, And of English Books Printed Abroad, 1475-1640*, 3 vols, second edition (London, 1976-91)
- Pollard, Alfred, 'Elizabethan Spelling as a Literary and Bibliographic Clue', *The Library*, 4th series, 4 (1923-4), 1-8
- Prindle, Roderic M., 'Apes and Boys, Men and Monsters. The Aesthetics of Elizabethan Acting' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, 1977)
- Rabkin, Norman, 'Problems in the Study of Collaboration', *RORD*, 19 (1976), 7-13
- Reibetanz, John, 'Theatrical Emblems in *King Lear*', in *Some facets of King Lear: Essays in Prismatic Criticism*, edited by Rosalie L.Colie and F.T.Flahiff (Toronto, London, 1974), pp.39-57
- Riddell, James A., 'Some Actors in Ben Jonson's Plays', *Shakespeare Studies*,



- 5 (1969), 285-98
- Righter, Anne, *Shakespeare and the Idea of the Play* (London, 1962)
- Robertson, Jean and D.J.Gordon, *A Calendar of Dramatic Records in the Books of the Livery Companies of London, 1485-1640*, Malone Society Collections, 3 (Oxford, 1954)
- Rose, Mary Beth, *The Expense of Spirit: Love and Sexuality in English Renaissance Drama* (Ithaca, London, 1988)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Women in Men's Clothing: Apparel and Social Stability in *The Roaring Girl*', *English Literary Renaissance*, 14 (1984), 367-91
- Rosenbach, Abraham S.Wolf, 'The Curious Impertinent in English Dramatic Literature before Shelton's Translation of *Don Quixote*', *Modern Language Notes* 17 (1902), 357-67
- Rosenberg, Marvin, 'Elizabethan Actors: Men or Marionettes', *PMLA*, 69 (1954), 915-27
- Rossiter, A.P., 'Comic Relief', in *Angel with Horns and other Shakespeare Lectures*, edited by Graham Storey (London, 1961), pp.274-92
- Rulfs, Donald, 'Beaumont and Fletcher on the London Stage, 1776-1833', *PMLA*, 63 (1948), 1245-64
- Sandys, George, *A Relation of a Journey* (London, 1615)
- Savage, James E., 'The Date of Beaumont and Fletcher's *Cupid's Revenge*', *ELH*, 15 (1948), 286-94
- Schoenbaum, S., *Internal Evidence and Elizabethan Dramatic Authorship: An Essay in Literary History and Method* (London, Evanston, 1966)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Wit's Triumvirate: A Caroline Comedy Recovered', *Studies in English Literature 1500-1900*, 4 (1964), 227-37
- Schwartz, Herbert F., 'One of the Sources of *The Queen of Corinth*', *Modern Language Notes*, 24 (1909), 76-77
- Scott, Virginia P., 'The *Jeu* and the Role: Analysis of the Appeals of the Italian Comedy in France in the Time of Arlequin-Dominique', in *Western Popular Theatre*, edited by David Mayer and Kenneth Richards (London, New York, 1977), pp.1-27
- Seltzer, Daniel, 'The Actors and Staging', in *A New Companion to Shakespeare Studies*, edited by Kenneth Muir and S.Schoenbaum (Cambridge, 1971), pp.35-54
- Shapiro, Michael, *Children of the Revels: The Boy Companies of Shakespeare's Time and Their Plays* (New York, 1977)
- Sharratt, Bernard, 'The politics of the popular? - from melodrama to television' in *Performance and Politics in Popular Drama*, edited by David Bradby, Louis James and Bernard Sharratt (Cambridge, 1980), pp.275-95
- Sherbo, Arthur, 'The Uses and Abuses of Internal Evidence: The Case for Internal Evidence', *Bulletin of New York Public Library*, 63 (1959), 5-20
- Shirley, Frances, *Shakespeare's Use of Off Stage Sounds* (Lincoln, Nebraska, 1963)
- Smallwood, R.L., '"Here in the Friars": Immediacy and Theatricality in *The Alchemist*', *RES*, ns.32 (1981), 142-60



- Smith, Irwin, *Shakespeare's Blackfriars' Playhouse: Its History and its Design* (New York, 1964)
- Smith, Warren D., 'The Elizabethan Stage and Shakespeare's Entrance Announcements', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 4 (1953), 405-410
- Somerset, J.A.B., 'The Comic Turn in English Drama, 1470-1616' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Birmingham, 1966)
- The Spanish Tragedy, containing the Lamentable Murder of Horatio and Bellimperia with the Pitiful Death of Old Hieronimo. To the Tune of Queen Dido* (London, ?1620)
- Sprague, Arthur Colby, *Beaumont and Fletcher on the Restoration Stage*, reissued (New York, London, 1965)
- Spurgeon, Caroline, 'Imagery in the Sir Thomas More fragment', *RES*, 6 (1930), 257-70
- Stagg, Louis C., *An Index to the Figurative Language of Ben Jonson's Tragedies* (Charlottesville, 1967)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *An Index to the Figurative Language of Cyril Tourneur's Tragedies* (Charlottesville, 1970)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *An Index to the Figurative Language of George Chapman's Tragedies* (Charlottesville, 1970)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *An Index to the Figurative Language of John Marston's Tragedies* (Charlottesville, 1970)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *An Index to the Figurative Language of John Webster's Tragedies* (Charlottesville, 1967)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *An Index to the Figurative Language of Thomas Heywood's Tragedies* (Charlottesville, 1967)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *An Index to the Figurative Language of Thomas Middleton's Tragedies* (Charlottesville, 1970)
- Steele, Mary Susan, *Plays and Masques at Court During the Reigns of Elizabeth, James and Charles* (New York, 1926, reissued 1968)
- Stoll, Elmer Edgar, *John Webster, The Periods of his Work as determined by his Relations to the Drama of his Day* (Boston, 1905)
- Stone, Laurence, *Companies of Players Entertained by the Earl of Cumberland and Lord Clifford, 1607-39*, Malone Society Collections, 5 (Oxford, 1960)
- Streett, J.G.B., 'Some aspects of the influence of the boy-actress convention on the plays of Shakespeare and some of his contemporary dramatists' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oxford, 1974)
- Streitberger, W.R., ed., *Jacobean and Caroline Revels Accounts, 1603-42*, Malone Society Collections, 13 (Oxford, 1986)
- Sturges, Keith, *Jacobean Private Theatre*, Theatre Production Studies (London, New York, 1987)
- Sutherland, Sarah P., *Masques in Jacobean Tragedy* (New York, 1983)
- Swaen, A.E.H., 'Robert Daborne's Plays', *Anglia*, 209 (1898), 153-256
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Robert Daborne's Plays', *Anglia*, 21 (1898), 373-440
- Sykes, H.D., 'An Attempt to Determine the Date of Webster's *Appius and Virginia*', *Notes and Queries*, 127 (1913), 401-3
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Sidelights on Elizabethan Drama: A Series of Studies Dealing*



- with the Authorship of sixteenth and seventeenth century Plays (London, 1924)
- Tannenbaum, S.A., *'The Booke of Sir Thomas More': A Bibliotic Study* (New York, 1927)
- Taylor, Patricia Minton, 'Modest Maids, Matrons and Miscreants: the women in the Chastity Plays of John Fletcher (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern Illinois, 1981)
- Thompson, E.M., *Shakespeare's Handwriting* (Oxford, 1916)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Handwriting of the Three Pages Attributed to Shakespeare compared with his signatures', in *Shakespeare's Hand in the Plays of Sir Thomas More* (Cambridge, 1923), pp.57-112
- Thompson, E.N.S., 'Elizabethan Dramatic Collaboration', *Englische Studien*, 40 (1909), 30-35
- Thomson, Peter, 'Henry Livings and the Accessible Theatre', in *Western Popular Theatre*, edited by David Mayer and Kenneth Richards (London, New York, 1977), pp.187-202
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Shakespeare's Theatre*, Theatre Production Studies (London, 1983)
- Thornberry, R., 'Shakespeare and the Blackfriars Tradition, 1600-1606' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1964)
- Thorndike, A.H., *The Influence of Beaumont and Fletcher on Shakespere* (New York, 1901)
- Tilley, Morris Palmer, *A Dictionary of the Proverbs in England in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century* (Ann Arbor, 1950)
- Townshend, Aurelian, *Aurelian Townshend's Poems and Masks*, edited by E.K.Chambers, Tudor and Stuart Library (Oxford, 1912)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Poems and Masques of Aurelian Townshend*, edited by Cedric C.Browne (Reading, 1983)
- Tricomi, Albert H., 'The Revised Bussy D'Ambois and The Revenge of Bussy D'Ambois: Joint Performance in Thematic Counterpoint', *ELH*, 9 (1972), 253-62
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Two letters concerning George Chapman', *MLR*, 75 (1980), 241-48
- Ure, Peter, 'Chapman's Tragedy of Bussy D'Ambois: Problems of the Revised Quarto', *MLR*, 48 (1953), 257-69
- Van Lennep, William and others, *The London Stage, 1660-1800. A Calendar of Plays, Entertainments & Afterpieces Together with Casts, Box-Receipts and Contemporary Comment compiled from the Playbills, Newspapers and Theatrical Diaries of the Period*, 12 vols (Carbondale, Illinois, 1960-79)
- Verhasselt, E., 'A Biography of Nathan Field, Dramatist and Actor', *Revue Belge de philologie et d'histoire*, 25 (1946-7), 485-508
- Waith, E.M., 'The Sources of *The Double Marriage* by Fletcher and Massinger', *Modern Language Notes*, 64 (1949), 505-10
- Waith, Eugene, *The Pattern of Tragi-Comedy in Beaumont and Fletcher* (New Haven, 1952)
- Wallace, C.W., *The Children of the Chapel at Blackfriars 1597-1603* (Nebraska, 1908)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Shakespeare and his London Associates as Revealed in Recently Discovered Documents* (Lincoln, Nebraska, 1910)



- Wann, Louis, 'The Collaboration of Beaumont, Fletcher and Massinger', in *Shakespeare Studies*, University of Wisconsin; Department of English (Madison, 1916)
- Warner, G.F., *Catalogue of Manuscripts and Muniments of Dulwich College* (London, 1881)
- Watson, Foster, *The English Grammar School* (Cambridge, 1908; reprinted London, 1968)
- Watson, Ian, *Conversations with Ayckbourn* (London, 1981)
- Wearing, J.P. ed., *The London Stage, 1900-1909, A Calendar of Plays and Players* (London, New Jersey, 1981)
- Weimann, Robert, *Shakespeare and the Popular Tradition in the Theatre: Studies in the Social Dimension of Dramatic Form and Function*, edited by Robert Schwartz (Baltimore, London, 1978)
- Wells, William, 'The Bloody Brother', *Notes and Queries*, 154 (1928), 6-9
- Welsford, Enid, *The Court Masque: A Study in the Relationship between Poetry and the Revels* (New York, 1927)
- West, Vita Sackville, ed., *Diary of Lady Anne Clifford* (London, 1923)
- White, Beatrice, *Cast of Ravens: The Strange Case of Sir Thomas Overbury* (London, 1965)
- Whiter, W., *A Specimen of Commentary on Shakespeare* (London, 1794)
- Whitney, Geoffrey, *A Choice of Emblems and Other Devices* (London, 1586)
- Wickham, Glynne, *Early English Stages, 1300-1660*, 3 vols (London, 1959-1981), II, Part 1
- Williams, William Proctor, 'Not Hornpipes and Funerals: Fletcherian Tragicomedy', in *Renaissance Tragicomedy: Explorations in Genre and Politics*, edited by Nancy C. Maguire (New York, 1987), pp.139-54
- Wilson, F.P., 'Ralph Crane, Scrivener to the King's Players', *The Library*, 7 (1926), 194-215
- Wilson, F.P. and R.F. Hill, eds., *Dramatic Records in the Declared Accounts of the Office of Works, 1560-1640*, Malone Society Collections, 10 (Oxford, 1975 (1977))
- Wilson, J. Dover, 'Bibliographical Links between the Three Pages and the Good Quartos', in *Shakespeare's Hand in the Play of Sir Thomas More*, edited by A.W. Pollard and others (Cambridge, 1923), pp.113-41
- Wing, Donald, *Short Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland and Ireland... 1641-1700*, 3 vols (New York, 1945-51)
- Wren, Robert Meriweather, *The Blackfriars Theatre and Its Repertory, 1600-1608* (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Princeton University, 1965)

#### Section 4, Manuscripts, Newspapers, Magazines

'Brave Mars and Mighty Pallas', Bodleian MS Eng Poet C11 fol.72r

*Preist the Barber* in *Cambridge Dramatic and Poetical Miscellany* (ca 1615-ca 1630), Folger Shakespeare Library, MS 2203.2

	<i>Birmingham Daily Mail</i>	21 April 1914
	<i>Birmingham Daily Post</i>	20 April 1914
	<i>Birmingham Gazette</i>	20 April 1914
Feay, Suzi,	<i>Time Out</i>	26 February- 4 March 1992
Hall, Lilian,	<i>Stratford-upon-Avon Herald</i>	24 April 1914
Kingsley, Louise,	<i>Independent</i>	21 February 1992
Kingston, Jeremy	<i>The Times</i>	22 February 1992
Milliken, R.T. Rundle,	<i>Stratford-upon-Avon Herald</i>	1 May 1914
	<i>Pall Mall Gazette</i>	20 April 1914
	<i>Standard</i>	28 April 1914
Stopes, C.C.,	<i>Stratford-upon-Avon Herald</i>	1 May 1914
	<i>Stratford-upon-Avon Herald</i>	17 April 1914
Tait, Simon,	<i>The Times</i>	24 January 1992
	<i>The Times</i>	28 April 1914
Wardle, Irving,	<i>Independent on Sunday</i>	23 February 1992